7704301

HUMAN SERVICES IN BAY AREA CITIES

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL STUDIES LIBRARY
FEB 7 0 1977
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ABAG
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

NOVEMBER 1976

Human Services in Bay Area Cities

Soc welf SF bay area

This study is a part of the Association of Bay Area Governments' Capacity Building Project which was funded in part by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare Partnership Grant Program.

November 1976

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Association of Bay Area Governments gratefully acknowledges the valuable contributions made by the following persons in the formulation of Human Services in Bay Area Cities, and by many others too numerous to mention. Special thanks go to Dianne McKenna of the League of California Cities for her excellent contributions to this study. It is also noted that this report would have been impossible without the efforts of those respondents in the 69 cities who took the time to complete the questionnaires.

Donald C. Benninghoven, Executive Director, League of California Cities
Louis N. Garcia, Assistant Director, League of California Cities
Edward Schoenberger, Deputy Director, Institute for Local Self Government
John Williamson, Student Intern, League of California Cities

ABAG PARTICIPATING STAFF

Department of Planning and Programming

Charles Q. Forester, Assistant Director
Bessanderson McNeil, Chief, Human Services Division
Bill Newton, Regional Planner
Arlyne June, Regional Planner (Project Coordinator)
Meg Goldman, Student Intern
Ralph Zackheim, Student Intern
Pamela Verdin, Planning Aide
Bernadine Bailey, Secretary

Department of Technical Services

Paul Wilson, Chief, Technical Information Division
Percy Jackson, Programmer
Marjorie Ng, Librarian/Information Specialist
Donald A. Olmstead, Chief, Cartography and Graphics Division
Margie Faulkner, Graphics Designer

Department of Public Affairs

Douglas C. Detling, Assistant to the Director

Department of Administration

Yvonne Young, Supervisor, Correspondence Center
Kay Janz, Correspondence Center Typist
James E. Lowe, Supervisor, Printing and Supplies
Tim Robinson, Offset Duplicating Machine Operator
Rosalie Machado, Supply Clerk

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS (continued)

Senior ABAG Staff

Executive Director	Revan A. F. Tranter
Associate Executive Director	Dean L. Macris
Director of Administration	Terry P. Bergman
Director of Planning and Programming	John H. McKoy
Director of Public Affairs	Lizette Weiss
Director of Technical Services	Robert E. Goldman

Human Services in Bay Area Cities
Table of Contents

	Page
I. Executive Summary	1
II. Introduction	2
A. Purpose of Report	2
B. Methodology	3
C. Description of Sample	3
III. Synopsis of Findings	5
IV. Detailed Findings	9
A. City Council Action on Human Services	9
B. City Involvement in Human Services Planning and Program Operations	13
1. Planning Activities	14
a. Needs Assessment	14
b. Social Services Inventory	19
c. Social Element to the General Plan	20
d. Evaluation	23
2. Program Operations and Funding of Community Based Organizations	25
C. Funding Sources for Human Services Planning and Programs	32
D. Staffing for Human Services	33
E. City Human Services Involvement with Outside Agencies - Both Governmental and Non-Governmental	34
F. Relationship Between Social and Physical Planning	39
G. Citizen Participation in Human Services Planning	40
H. Other City Human Services Activities	41
V. Conclusion	46
VI. Appendixes	
A. Survey Questionnaire	
B. Coding Scheme	
C. List of Bay Area Respondents and Non Respondents	
D. Discussion of demographic representativeness of Bay Area survey	
E. List of cities involved in specific human services activities	

LIST OF CHARTS AND TABLES

		Page
Chart I	Staff Position of City Respondents	3
Chart II	Number of Respondents and Non-Respondents, By County	4
Chart III	Population of Respondent Cities	4

Table 1	City Council Action Related to City Involvement With Outside Agencies	9
Table 2	City Council Action Related to Funding Sources Used for Human Services	10
Table 3	Type of City Council Action on Human Services, By County in Which City is Located	10
Table 4	Type of City Council Action By City Size	11
Table 4a	Type of City Council Action By City Size--Comparison Between Very Small and Very Large Cities	11
Table 5	Type of City Council Action on Human Services, By Percent Population Change Between 1960 and 1970	12
Table 6	City Involvement in Needs Assessment	15
Table 7	Cities Not Contemplating Needs Assessment, By City Size	15
Table 8	City Involvement in Needs Assessment, By County	16
Table 9	Data Sources for Needs Assessment	17
Table 10	Needs Assessment Involvement Related to Other Aspects of City Social Planning	18
Table 11	Needs Assessment Involvement Related to City Human Services Program Operations and Funding of Services	19
Table 12	City Involvement in a Social Service Inventory	20
Table 13	City Involvement in a Social Element	21
Table 14	Cities Not Contemplating Doing a Social Element, By City Size	21
Table 15	City Social Element Preparation, By County	22
Table 16	City Involvement in Evaluation	23
Table 17	City Involvement in Evaluation, By Whether or Not Cities are Operating or Funding Human Services Programs	24

LIST OF CHARTS AND TABLES (continued)

		Page
Table 18	City Involvement in Evaluation, By Type of Service Operated By City	24
Table 19	City Operation of Social Programs	26
Table 20	City Funding of Non-City Social Programs	26
Table 21	Social Program Activities, By Size of City	27
Table 22	Categories of Services, By Number and Percent of Cities Operating or Funding That Service	28
Table 23	Types of City Services, By county	30
Table 24	Numbers of Types of Services Operated or Funded, By City Size	31
Table 25	Funding Sources Used for Human Services Planning and Programs	32
Table 26	Organizational Location of Human Services Activities	33
Table 27	Organizational Location of Major Human Services Planning	34
Table 28	Agencies That are Involved With Cities in Human Services Activities	35
Table 29	Agencies That are Involved With Cities in Human Services, By County	36
Table 29a	County Agency of City-County Involvement, By County	36
Table 30	Cities Showing Involvement With Specific Agencies, By Agency	38
Table 31	Integration of Physical and Social Planning	39
Table 32	Groups Involved in Citizen Participation	41
Table 33	Funding Source By Whether or Not Cities Involve Citizens in Planning	41

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
State of California and California State Library

https://archive.org/details/C124900690

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - HUMAN SERVICES IN BAY AREA CITIES

What are cities doing in the field of human services?

In an attempt to answer this question, ABAG and the League of California Cities conducted a survey of California cities in the Spring of 1976. This report covers cities in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area.

General Background

The 1970's have seen a trend toward decentralization of social planning and allocation decisions from the Federal to the state and local levels. The advent of such legislation as General Revenue Sharing (1972), Federal bloc grants such as CETA (1973) and HCDA (1974), as well as the League's Action Plan for the Social Responsibilities of Cities (1973) prompted some California cities to increase or initiate actions to deal with social problems in their communities. The survey describes how cities are involved in human services and what specific activities are being undertaken.

Sixty-nine of the 93 Bay Area cities responded to the survey. The cities are listed in Appendix A.

Major Findings

There is a great deal of direct city involvement in human services.

1. Half of the Bay Area city councils in the survey have established either overall policies to deal with social problems or have taken a formal stand on specific human services issues, such as drug abuse, child care, etc.

2. Twenty Bay Area cities are now conducting human service needs assessments--16 more are considering doing so.

3. Although a social element of the general plan is not mandated, 11 cities are preparing these plans, and 17 more are contemplating such activity.

4. Thirty-eight cities are actually operating social programs, such as services to senior citizens, children, youth and the handicapped, in addition to employment and economic development services.

5. A large number of Bay Area cities use portions of their "discretionary" money (e.g., General Fund - 38 cities, and General Revenue Sharing - 23 cities) for human services.

6. While 62 percent of Bay Area cities are operating human services programs, only 27 percent are involved in program evaluation.

7. A majority of the cities in the survey report attempts to "integrate" physical and social planning.

8. City staffing for human service planning is most often located in the city manager's office, although some cities have established (or intend to establish) separate human service departments.

II. INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE OF REPORT

In the Spring of 1976, The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the League of California Cities conducted a survey to acquire information on what cities were doing in the field of human services. This information, we felt, would be of interest both to those cities that want to begin human services planning and those that are currently involved, and might point out areas where ABAG and the League could help.

Although planning for social services had been done on the Federal level in past years, more recently the responsibility for this planning has shifted to state and local government - with the state and counties having primary authority for the planning and delivery of welfare and health services. The advent of General Revenue Sharing (1972), Federal "bloc grants" (CETA (1973), HCDA (1974), etc.) and the League's Action Plan For the Social Responsibility of Cities (1973) prompted some California cities to begin or increase their work in the area of human services.

For the purpose of this study, human services is defined as:

> "Any service or activity designed to promote the social welfare of the individual or community. These may be differentiated from physical services such as sewage treatment or road repair, but their relationship must always be borne in mind. For example, senior citizens needing health care (social service) and living in a rural area may be unable to utilize such services because the area lacks adequate transportation (physical service). Generally, social or human services include: housing, employment, income, health, mental health, education, leisure, and recreation. Often human services are described in terms of client groups: youth services, services to the handicapped, to the aging, to minorities, etc. Also, services that apply to many subject areas and client groups may be included: legal services, transportation, emergency services, supportive services and information and referral services. (Definition from "Assessing Human Needs," League of California Cities.)"

The objective of this report, then, is to document how many cities are involved in human services and to determine what they are doing in the areas of human services planning and human service program operation. In this report, "planning is defined as activities such as needs assessment, inventories of social services, and other activities leading to the development of human resources policy goals and objectives. Program operations is defined as the actual delivery of social service to a client." (Definition from survey questionnaire.)

METHODOLOGY

Both the League and ABAG expressed interest in conducting human services surveys of cities as part of their Department of Health, Education and Welfare (DHEW) partnership grants. To avoid duplication of efforts and to lessen the burden on city respondents, the two agencies agreed to a joint effort. A questionnaire was mailed with the February 1976 issue of the League's Human Resources Newsletter to all city managers -- city clerks in non manager cities -- in the State. Questionnaires were returned to ABAG for data processing.

Staff of both agencies developed the survey questionnaire. The draft questionnaire was pretested on three city managers and three city human services staff persons. A copy of the questionnaire appears in Appendix A.

A coding scheme was developed. Open-ended responses (those that were not multiple-choice items) were coded by a four person ABAG-League team. When an answer was not coded the same way by all four members, the team would vote on appropriate categorization of the response. This was an attempt to obtain a degree of objectivity and to attain reliability and validity in the coding of responses. A copy of the coding scheme appears in Appendix B.

A computer program called Statistical Package For the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for electronic data processing. The data processing for all cities was done by ABAG's Department of Technical Services.

Since ABAG's interest was in cities in the San Francisco Bay Area and the League's focus was statewide, a decision was made to write two separate reports.

DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE

Sixty-nine of the 93 Bay Area cities (74%) responded to the survey. (The initial response rate of 50% was increased by an intensive phone and mail follow-up in the Bay Area.) The list of respondents and non respondents appears in Appendix C.

The distribution by staff position of persons who responded for cities is shown below:

Chart I - Staff Position of City Respondents

Staff Position	Number of Cities	% of Total
City Manager	18	26%
Administrative Assistant or Assistant to the City Manager	24	35%
Planning Director or Staff	10	14%
Human Services Director	4	6%
Other (includes 2 council members, 3 city clerks, 2 directors of recreation)	13	19%
Total	69	

The following breakdowns show the number and percentage of respondents by county and by city size:

Chart II - Number of Respondents and Nonrespondents By County

County	Cities Responding	Cities Not Responding	Total Cities	Percent of Cities Responding By County
Alameda	12	1	13	92%
Contra Costa	12	3	15	80%
Marin	6	5	11	55%
Napa	1	3	4	25%
San Francisco*	1	-	1	100%
San Mateo	14	5	19	74%
Santa Clara	11	4	15	73%
Solano	4	3	7	57%
Sonoma	8	-	8	100%
TOTAL	69	24	93	

* (see below)

Chart III - Population of Respondent Cities

City Size (Current Dept. of Finance Estimate)	Number of Cities	Percent of Sample
Under 10,000	16	23%
10,000 - 24,999	12	17%
25,000 - 49,999	22	32%
50,000 - 99,999	14	20%
100,000 or more	5	7%

Statistics compiled by the San Francisco Bay Area Council showing demographic characteristics of the Bay Area were compared to the demographic characteristics of the survey sample to determine the actual representativeness of the sample. A detailed discussion appears in Appendix D. It did appear that, on the whole, the survey sample was representative of the Bay Area.

* It should be noted that San Francisco's unique feature of being both the City and the County makes it difficult to relate its human services activities to those of other cities.

III. SYNOPSIS OF FINDINGS

Council Action

Half of the Bay Area city councils in the survey have established policies in the area of human services. Nineteen percent have developed an overall formal policy describing their commitment to deal with social problems. Another 31% have established policies on individual specific social issues such as drug abuse, child care, etc. Cities experiencing net population loss or slower growth, cities with a large population, and cities in Alameda County appear most likely to have established these policies.

Cities that have council policies in human services are more likely to have specific human services staff, a separate human services department, and be more apt to have attempted to integrate physical and social planning than cities in which the council has not acted on human services issues. Also, cities in which the council has established an overall policy are most likely to be using General Fund monies for human services and to be involved in human services with other governments and agencies outside of the city, such as county government, community action agencies, ABAG and the League of California Cities.

It appears that positive action by policy makers, while not necessarily directing specific human services activities, establishes a receptive climate for increasing or intensifying these specific activities. City council commitment is considered by many to be the most critical ingredient in determining the success of effective human services involvement for cities.

Planning Activities

Many Bay Area cities are actively involved in key elements of social planning. Survey results show that of the 69 cities responding:

- 33% are doing needs assessment
- 36% are designing a social services inventory
- 19% are preparing a social element
- 26% are evaluating human service activities

Many of the cities involved in one aspect of human services planning are also involved in others. Most of the cities not considering social planning are small in size, with populations under 10,000.

Needs assessment is generally the first major step in a social planning process. Santa Clara County, followed closely by Alameda County, has the largest proportion of cities actively involved in needs assessment.[1] Some cities involved in operating or funding programs have not done (and are not planning to do) a needs assessment, and many of these cities are not involved in evaluation. For example, only 37% of the cities that are funding programs for the aging are actually involved in evaluation -- and we do not know if they are specifically evaluating aging services.

---

1 Both Alameda and Santa Clara counties are engaged in county wide human services planning. (Alameda has a county Human Services Council; Santa Clara has a countywide "needs assessment" project funded by DHEW.)

Cities doing needs assessments were likely to be dealing with the county, ABAG, community action agencies, the League of California Cities, other cities and United Way -- in that order. All of the cities preparing a social element of their general plan show citizen participation in the planning process.

The importance of evaluation to decision makers is illustrated by the finding that 64% of the respondent cities are actively involved or are contemplating work in evaluation. This is the largest percentage of cities involved or anticipating involvement in any aspect of the planning process.

Major data sources used for assessing needs are the census, other statistical data, citizen input, surveys, social service inventories and input from service providers--in that order. Most cities are using more than one source, tending to combine qualitative with quanitative data.

Program Activities

Fully 62% of Bay Area cities are actively involved in operating social programs; 54% are funding community-based organizations and other agencies who deliver services. Many cities do both.

The most frequently operated and funded types of services are services to older adults, recreation services, employment services, children and youth services, and housing.

The larger the city, the more likely that it will be operating social programs. The same relationship holds true in terms of variety of services. However, it should be noted that 36% of the cities with populations under 10,000 are operating or funding some social programs.

Of the 39 cities that actually operate programs, 29 note that they have some involvement with the county. Since the primary deliverer of social services in California is the county, it may be a serious problem in terms of coordination and potential duplication that 10 cities that are delivering services report no involvement with their respective county.

Funding Sources

Over half of the Bay Area cities in the sample (38 cities) were using General Fund monies for human services and 23 were using General Revenue Sharing. Some cities use both sources.

This is a significant finding in view of the fact that, unlike other funds, this money does not have to be used for human services. The use of these funds appears to indicate a substantial commitment to human services on the part of cities. It is notable also that a major portion of General Fund monies was used for human services planning.

The other sources used were CETA (34 cities), HCDA (32 cities) and HUD 701 (12 cities). All of these sources require the submission of special applications to the Federal government, thus requiring cities to develop grantsmanship skills.

Staffing

Sixty percent of the cities stated that there were specific staff devoted to human services activities. The major organizational centers of human services activity were the city manager's office (23 cities), the recreation department (17 cities), and the planning department (15 cities). Four cities had a separate human services department, five are in the process of creating one, and four more are contemplating the establishment of one. Fully half of all the human services planning is done in the city manager's office. Half of all cities involved in human services have more than one department involved in these activities.

Involvement With Agencies Outside of City Government

Agencies most often identified as being involved with the cities in overall human services activities are county government (39 cities), community action agencies (26 cities), ABAG (25 cities), the League of California Cities (21 cities), other cities (18 cities) and United Way (17 cities).

The three most often cited methods of involvement were: 1) information sharing, 2) technical assistance and 3) joint program development.

Cities receiving technical assistance were most likely to mention involvement with ABAG and United Way.

The county planning department appears to be the major point of city-county contact in all counties, followed by the social services department and the human services agency which is sometimes an "umbrella agency" combining health, welfare, mental health, etc.

When the major city human services planning is done by the recreation or the planning departments, the data show that involvement with outside agencies (other than the county) is much less than when the planning is done in other departments such as the city manager's office or a separate human services department.

Integration of Physical and Social Planning

More than half of the cities report attempts to integrate physical and social planning. Methods used most often are:

Through (1) the traditional planning process such as addressing social issues throughout the general plan and/or adding social planners to the planning department (14 cities).

(2) the HCDA planning processes, such as the Housing Assistance Plan (7 cities).

(3) the addition of a social element to the general plan (5 cities - not all cities developing a social element mentioned this element as a link between physical and social planning).

Our analysis shows that cities are more likely to be integrating physical and social planning (as they perceive this integration) if the major human service planning is done in the planning department.

Citizen Participation

Almost three-fourths of the Bay Area cities showed citizen involvement in the human services planning process. Most cities used more than one mechanism for citizen participation. The most used methods were public hearings, appointed committees and citizen commissions. In fact, 42 cities were either using an existing commission to do human service planning or establishing a new human services commission.

Groups or organizations involved in citizen participation are (in rank order by number of responses given) community based groups, service provider groups, service groups, ethnic or minority groups and client oriented groups.

Cities that report no citizen participation usually do not use the major funding sources (e.g., General Fund, General Revenue Sharing, HCDA, and CETA) for human services.

IV. DETAILED FINDINGS

This section discusses detailed findings of the survey.

A. CITY COUNCIL ACTION ON HUMAN SERVICES

Commitment by the city council is critical in assuring a successful social planning process. Only with the approval and input of the policy makers will the important connections be made between planning, policy and programs.

The survey questionnaire asked "Has the city council established an overall formal policy describing its commitment to deal with social problems existing within its boundaries?" There were three possible responses - "yes," "no," and "council has established policies only on individual social issues such as drug abuse, child care, etc." Thus, while there were two possibilities for a "definitive" response, the third could include decisions to fund specific programs rather than an overall commitment to human services. It was felt that the simple "yes" answer represented the greatest commitment.

In 14 (20%) of the 69 Bay Area cities in the survey, the city council had taken action in terms of commitment to an overall human services policy. Twenty-one cities (30%) had established policies with regard to specific human services issues and 34 of the cities had not established any human services policies.[2]

The breakdown below (Table 1) indicates that in every instance, cities with an overall human services policy are more likely to be coordinating with or involved with other governmental and non-governmental agencies than cities that have no such policy.

Table 1 - City Council Action Related to City Involvement with Outside Agencies

Council Action	Total*	County Govt.	Community Action Agency	ABAG	League	Other Cities	United Way
Council has established overall policy	14	69%	69%	54%	46%	39%	46%
Council has not established policy	34	44%	29%	29%	27%	18%	15%

*one non response

[2] Of the 40 cities in which council action was taken, in 35% of the cases action was by ordinance; in 50% it was by resolution and in 14% it was by minute action.

Cities with human services policies are more likely to be using General Fund and CETA monies for human services than cities without such policies. (Table 2).

Table 2 - City Council Action Related to Funding Sources Used for Human Services

Council Action	Total	General Fund		General Revenue Sharing		HCDA		CETA	
	48	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Council has established overall policy	14	8(62%)	5(38%)	5(38%)	8(62%)	6(46%)	7(54%)	10(77%)	3(23%)
Council has has not established policy	34	13(38%)	21(62%)	9(26%)	25(74%)	14(41%)	20(59%)	9(26%)	25(74%)

City Council Action by County

Of the 14 cities in which the council had established an overall policy on human services, 5 were in Alameda County and 2 each were in the counties of Santa Clara, Solano and San Mateo. Detailed breakdowns by county are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Type of City Council Action on Human Services, by County in Which City is Located

County	Total cities	Type of City Council Action: Overall human services policy established	Action on specific human services issues only	No Action
Total	69=100%	14 (20%)	21 (31%)	34 (50%)
Alameda	12=100%	5 (42%)	5 (42%)	2 (16%)
Contra Costa	12=100%	1 (8%)	3 (25%)	8 (67%)
Marin	6=100%	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	4 (67%)
Napa	1=100%	-	-	1 (100%)
San Francisco	1=100%	-	1 (100%)	-
San Mateo	14=100%	2 (14%)	5 (36%)	7 (50%)
Santa Clara	11=100%	2 (18%)	4 (36%)	5 (46%)
Solano	4=100%	2 (50%)	-	2 (50%)
Sonoma	8=100%	1 (12%)	2 (25%)	2 (62%)

City Council Action by City Size

In terms of city size, Table 4 shows that smaller cities are less likely to have council action on human services than larger cities. When very small cities (those under 10,000 population) are compared to very large cities (those having population of 100,000 or over) the results are even more dramatic.

It is noted that this data is purely descriptive. A further and more detailed study would reveal reasons for specific types of council action. The focus of this report is on relationships of such action to human services activities.

Table 4. Type of City Council Action, by City Size

City Size (Population)	Total	Overall human services policy established	Action on specific Human Services issues only	No Action
Total	69=100%	14 (20%)	21 (30%)	34 (49%)
Under 24,999	29=100%	5 (17%)	7 (24%)	17 (59%)
25,000 to 49,999	21=100%	3 (14%)	5 (24%)	13 (62%)
Over 50,000	19=100%	6 (32%)	9 (47%)	4 (21%)

Table 4a. Type of City Council Action by City Size --

Comparison Between Very Small & Very Large Cities

	Total	Overall Human Service Policy Established	Action on Specific Human Service Issues Only	No Action
Total	21	4	4	13
Very Small (under 10,000)	16=100%	2 (12%)	2 (12%)	12 (75%)
Very Large (100,000 or over)	5=100%	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)

City Council Action by Population Growth

Are faster growing cities more likely to have council action on human services than those whose growth was slower and more stable? Table 5 indicates that the opposite is true. City councils in cities experiencing more growth appeared less likely to have established human services policies than councils in cities experiencing slower growth. In fact, each of the 6 cities that had a decrease in population had established some type of human services policy.

Table 5. Type of City Council Action on Human Services, by Percent Population Change Between 1960 & 1970

% Population Change	Council Action Taken							
	Total	Yes, overall human services est.		Action on specific HS issues only		No Action		
Total	64=100**	14	(22%)	21	(33%)	29	(45%)	
Net population loss	6=100	1	(17%)	5	(83%)	-		
Growth 1 to 27%*	19=100	6	(32%)	8	(42%)	5	(26%)	
Growth 28 to 74%	19=100	1	(5%)	6	(32%)	12	(63%)	
Growth 75% or more	20=100	6	(30%)	2	(10%)	12	(60%)	

* The breakpoint of 27% was chosen since that was the median net percent population increase for the Bay Area. (San Francisco Bay Area Council - Bay Area 1970 Census Series.)

** 5 missing observations.

B. CITY INVOLVEMENT IN HUMAN SERVICES PLANNING AND PROGRAM OPERATIONS

Question Number 2 of the survey questionnaire focused on city progress and intentions vis a vis various human services activities. The question read as follows:

2. Is the city contemplating or now doing any of the following activities? (Please check one space for each activity below)

	(1) Work is contemplated	(2) Council has approved start up	(3) Work has begun	(4) Work is completed	(5) Council has approved results	(6) Work is not contemplated
a. Needs Assessment	____	____	____	____	____	____
b. Inventory of Social Services	____	____	____	____	____	____
c. Development of a Social Element	____	____	____	____	____	____
d. Development of an Implementation Plan	____	____	____	____	____	____
e. Operation of Some Social Programs	____	____	____	____	____	____
f. Evaluation of Human Resources Policies and Programs	____	____	____	____	____	____
g. Establishment of Human Resources Dept., Agency or Unit	____	____	____	____	____	____
h. Establishment of City Human Resources Planning Commission	____	____	____	____	____	____
i. Use of an Existing Commission To Do Human Resources Planning	____	____	____	____	____	____
j. Funding of Non-City Organization or Services	____	____	____	____	____	____
k. Other, Please Specify						
_____	____	____	____	____	____	____
_____	____	____	____	____	____	____
_____	____	____	____	____	____	____

For the purposes of this paper, activities "a" (needs assessment), "b" (inventory of social services), "c" (development of a social element) and "f" (evaluation) were considered to be the major indicators of human services planning. Activities "e" (operation of programs) and "j" (funding of non-city programs) were considered to be indicators of program activities. The other activities are covered in various sections when relevant, and detailed information on these is available from ABAG's Human Services Division upon request.

In this report, cities are discussed as being "actively involved" in a given activity. The category of "active involvement" is a combination of columns 3, 4 and 5 and ranges from "work has begun" to "council has approved results".

1. PLANNING ACTIVITIES

Regardless of how social planning is approached, a needs assessment and an inventory of available social services are usually critical elements. Depending upon the orientation of the city, the process may or may not lead to the development of a social plan element. Evaluation of programs to determine whether needs are being met in an effective manner is also becoming recognized as an important ingredient that provides feedback into the total planning process. Each of these elements is discussed separately in the sections that follow.

a. Needs Assessment

A glossary prepared by ABAG for the members of the Human Services Capacity Building Task Force defines needs assessment as:

> "The initial step in human services planning (sometimes called needs and resource assessment). Basically this is a process designed to determine, within a given jurisdiction, who has what problems requiring which social services and what the capabilities of the public and private agencies are in terms of providing those services."

For many cities "problem identification" has become synonymous with "needs assessment." Thus, needs assessment is usually the first step of the planning process. It should be noted that cities do use different methodologies for needs assessment.

Table 6 shows that one-third of the Bay Area cities that responded are actively involved in doing a needs assessment. Two other city councils had given the "go-ahead" but, at the time of the survey, work had not yet begun. Twenty-three of the cities did not contemplate doing a needs assessment.

Table 6. City Involvement in Needs Assessment

Involvement	Number of cities*	Percent
Total	61	100%
Council approved start up	2	3%
Work has begun	14	23%
Work is completed	4	7%
Council has approved results	2	3%
(Total, actively involved**	20	33%)
Work is contemplated	16	26%
Work is not contempated	23	38%

*8 non responses

** As was noted previously "active involvement" is defined as including the categories of "work has begun," "is completed," or "council had approved results."

The majority of the cities not contemplating a needs assessment were "small" in size, as Table 7 shows. Ninety-one percent of them had populations under 50,000 and almost half of these had populations of under 10,000. All but two of the larger cities were either contemplating or actively involved in needs assessment.

Table 7. Cities Not Contemplating Needs Assessment, by City Size

City Size (population)	Number of cities	Percent
Total all Sizes	61	100%
Under 10,000	11	48%
10,000-24,999	5	22%
25,000-49,999	5	22%
50,000-99,999	2	9%
100,000 or more	0	---

* 8 non responses

Table 8. City Involvement in Needs Assessment, by County

County*	Total cities**	City Involvement: Actively Involved in Needs Assessment	%	Needs Assessment is Contemplated	%	Needs Assessment is not Contemplated	%
Alameda County	12	5	(42%)	5	(42%)	1	(8%)
Contra Costa Co.	12	2	(17%)	3	(25%)	5	(42%)
Marin County	6	-		1	(17%)	2	(33%)
San Francisco	1	-		1	(100%)	-	
San Mateo County	14	3	(21%)	3	(21%)	6	(43%)
Santa Clara Co.	11	7	(64%)	2	(18%)	2	(18%)
Solano County	4	1	(25%)	1	(25%)	2	(50%)
Sonoma County	8	2	(25%)	-		5	(63%)

* The one city respondent from Napa County did not answer this question.

** Categories do not add up to total due to some non responses and the fact that the category of "council has approved start up" was not included in the tabulation.

Differences Between Cities Doing and Not Intending to do a Needs Assessment

What are the differences between those 20 cities actively involved in doing a needs assessment and those 23 cities not contemplating such involvement?

- Thirty percent of the "actively involved" cities had established a city council policy on human services as compared to only 4% of the cities not intending to do a needs assessment.

- Three of the four cities with a separate human services department were actively involved in needs assessment. However, these numbers are too small to compare with the cities not having a human services department. But--of those cities not contemplating a needs assessment, not one had a human services department.

- In only 13% of the cities not contemplating a needs assessment, the major human services planning was done by staff in the city manager's office. The city manager was responsible for human services planning in 45% of the cities "actively involved" in needs assessment.

- Fifteen or 75% of the cities actively involved in needs assessment were attempting to integrate physical and social planning as were only five (22%) of the cities not contemplating a needs assessment.

- Cities that are actively involved in needs assessment are much more likely to be delivering a variety of services than cities not contemplating a needs assessment. Sixty percent of all "actively involved" cities were delivering 10 or more different type of services while only 9% of all cities not contemplating a needs assessment were operating 10 or more different types of services.

- Cities working on a needs assessment are much more likely to be involved with outside agencies (in terms of coordination or receipt of technical assistance) than cities not contemplating a needs assessment. Agencies with which these cities show the most involvement--in order--are county government (17 cities), ABAG (15), Community Action Agencies (13), the League of California Cities (10), United Way (10) and other cities (8).

Data Sources for the Needs Assessment

Table 9 shows the tools and techniques that cities are using to identify community needs. Respondents were not limited to one response.

Table 9 - Data Sources for Needs Assessment

Data Source	Number of cities using that source	Percent of total
Census Data	50	72%
Other Statistical Information	42	61%
Citizen & Consumer Input	41	59%
Surveys or Questionnaires	33	48%
Social Service Inventories	31	45%
Service Provider Input	24	35%

It is evident that most of the cities are using more than one data source. Many are combining demographic and statistical information with qualitative data from consumers and providers of services. Almost 3/4 of the sample are using census data and 2/3 are using other statistical information. Major sources for this statistical information appear to be county planning departments, other county departments, city planning departments, other city departments, state agencies, community action agencies and ABAG.

Cities in the counties of Santa Clara, Marin and Sonoma seem to make the most use of data from the county planning departments, and in Santa Clara County, 75% of the cities use data from the Community Action Agency. That agency, Economic and Social Opportunities, Inc. (ESO) has been oriented toward technical assistance to cities--and has assisted cities in the development of needs assessments and social elements.

Of the 41 cities using citizen input as a data source for identifying needs, 37% had established a formalized mechanism to obtain citizen views. Mechanisms mentioned most often were citizen committees or public hearings. Citizen participation in human services planning will be discussed in more detail in a later section of this paper.

Needs Assessment as Related to Other Aspects of City Human Services Planning

As Table 10 shows, with a few exceptions, cities that are actively involved in needs assessment also appear to be similarly involved in other aspects of the social planning process. Those cities not considering a needs assessment do not seem to be contemplating doing a social services inventory, a social element or program evaluation.

Table 10 - Needs Assessment Involvement Related To Other Aspects of City Social Planning

Involvement in Other Aspects of Social Planning by Specific Aspect	Total*	Needs Assessment Involvement: Actively Involved	Not Contemplated
Social Services Inventory			
Total --	62	20 **	23 **
Cities Actively Involved	21	17	1
Cities Not Contemplating	27	2	22
Social Element			
Total --	58	16	23
Cities Actively Involved	11	9	2
Cities Not Contemplating	28	3	21
Evaluation			
Total --	62	20	23
Cities Actively Involved	16	9	2
Cities Not Contemplating	22	- (11 cities are contemplating but not doing evaluation)	18

* Numbers vary due to non responses

** Totals shown are not the sum of the numbers shown. Two categories "contemplated" and "council has approved start up" are not shown here but are considered as part of the total.

Needs Assessment as Related to Program Operations

In terms of both operating and funding programs, the picture is different, as Table 11 shows. There are cities actively involved in both operating and funding social programs that are not intending to do a needs assessment. It is not known on what basis these cities chose the programs they operate or fund.

Table 11 - Needs Assessment Involvement Related To City Human Service Program Operations & Funding of Services

Involvement in Aspects of Program Activities	Total	Needs Assessment Involvement Actively Involved	Not Contemplated
Operation of Social Programs Total --	59*	17	23
Cities Actively Involved	36	14	10
Cities Not Contemplating	19	3	13
Funding Of Programs Total	59*	19	22
Cities Actively Involved	31	14	8
Cities Not Contemplating	21	2	12

* 10 non responses

Other Major Aspects of City Social Planning

As was shown in Table 10, many of the cities that are involved in needs assessment are also involved in other aspects of the social planning process. The relationship is closest vis-a-vis a social services inventory. Thus, to avoid repetition, the section on city involvement in inventory of social services will be brief and summarily descriptive. The section receiving the most detail will be the one on evaluation since much interest has been expressed in that area by member governments.

b. Social Services Inventories

The ABAG glossary defines a services inventory as "a compilation of available (human) services within a given jurisdiction. A services inventory is an integral part of the needs assessment process (service identification) and can usually be used for information and referral as well as for planning purposes."

While California counties are mandated by the State Welfare and Institutions Code to develop an inventory of social services (for information and referral purposes in the Welfare Department), it has been difficult for cities to use the county systems because geographic districts and definitions of categories of services vary. Thus, many cities have had to create their own social services inventories as part of their planning processes.

As Table 12 shows, 23 (36%) of the responding cities in the Bay Area are actively involved in developing social services inventories; another 43% are not intending to do a services inventory.

Table 12 - City Involvement in a Social Service Inventory

Involvement	Number of Cities*	Percent
Total	63	100%
Council approved start up	1	2%
Work has begun	12	19%
Work is completed	9	14%
Council has approved results	2	3%
(Total, actively involved	23	36%)
Work is contemplated	12	19%
Work is not contemplated	27	43%

* 6 non responses

c. Social Element

A social element is considered by some cities to be an end product of the social planning process. There are those persons who think that a social element should become a State mandated element.[3] Others feel that social concerns should be integrated into the already mandated elements of a general plan. Still others feel that a social policy process is desirable, and that a plan document may not be necessary or worthwhile.

Although it is not now required by the State, many cities have begun to develop a social element. Only one Bay Area city (Pleasanton) now has a completed social element that has been approved by its city council.

[3] Recent proposed legislation (AB 3352) would have created an alternative to the general plan with only three required "analyses": 1) economic and fiscal, 2) physical and environmental and 3) human resources. This legislation is likely to be reintroduced in the future.

City involvement in social element preparation is shown below in Table 13.

Table 13 - City Involvement in a Social Element

Involvement	Number of Cities*	%
Total	57	100%
Work has begun on a social element	8	14%
Work is completed	2	4%
Council has approved results	1	2%
(Total, actively involved	11	20%)
Council has approved start up	1	2%
Work is contemplated	17	30%
Work is not contemplated	28	49%

* 12 non responses

It is significant that 11 of the 57 cities responding to this question are actively involved in the preparation of a social element and, in one other city, the council has given approval to begin. Seventeen other cities are contemplating such action, while 28 are not.

Is city size related to whether or not a city intends to prepare a social element? As was the case with needs assessment, Table 14 indicates that smaller cities are less likely to be considering the preparation of a social element than larger cities.

Table 14 - Cities Not Contemplating Doing A Social Element, By City Size

Population of city	Total* Cities	Not Contemplating A Social Element	Percent Not Contemplating A Social Element
Under 25,000	24	15	63%
50,000 or more	17	6	35%

* Not every city in the population categories shown responded to this question.

Table 15 shows the distribution by County.

Table 15 - City Social Element Preparation, by County

	Total Cities*		Cities Actively Involved in a Social Element		Cities Contemplating a Social Element		Cities Not Contemplating a Social Element	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Alameda Co.	12	=100%	3	(25%)	3	(25%)	4	(33%)
Contra Costa County	12	=100%	1	(8%)	4	(33%)	5	(42%)
Marin County	6	=100%	1	(17%)	-	--	3	(50%)
San Francisco	1	=100%	-	--	1	(100%)	-	--
San Mateo Co.	14	=100%	1	(7%)	3	(21%)	8	(57%)
Santa Clara Co.	11	=100%	4	(36%)	3	(27%)	2	(18%)
Solano Co.	4	=100%	-	--	2	(50%)	2	(50%)
Sonoma Co.	8	=100%	1	(12%)	1	(12%)	4	(50%)

* Categories do not add up to totals due to some non-responses and the fact that the category of "council has approved start up" was not included in the tabulation.

Of the 11 cities now preparing a social element, 8 reported outside involvement with county government, 7 with community action agencies, 7 with ABAG, 4 with the League, 4 with United Way and 2 with other cities.

The following characteristics were found between the 11 cities actively involved in a social element and the 28 cities not considering the preparation of one.[4]

- 62% of the cities preparing a social element and 46% of the cities not intending to do one, have specific staff for human services.
- Five of the eleven cities involved in preparing a social element report planning department involvement in human services; only four of the 28 cities not contemplating an element report such involvement of the planning department. This means, however, that six of the cities actively involved in producing a social element to the general plan do not have human service involvement in their planning department.

---

[4] As was noted, a social element is not always the goal of a city's human service planning process. Thus, this indicator is probably not as accurate as "needs assessment" in terms of assessing city commitment to human services planning.

- Ten of the 11 cities working on a social element are attempting to integrate physical and social planning as are nine of the 28 cities not contemplating a social element.

- All of the cities preparing a social element stated that there had been citizen participation. Sixty-one percent of the cities not contemplating a social element showed such participation in human services planning.

d. Evaluation

Evaluation of human service programs is increasingly recognized as a critical element of social planning. How does one know what works--and more important--what is meant by "working"? Elected officials need this type of information to determine, for instance, whether or not a given program should be refunded. One of the most important and difficult tasks is linking evaluation to the policy process.

Due to the nature of the questionnaire and the complexity of the whole issue of evaluation, it was not determined "how" a city was doing evaluation. This survey determined whether or not cities intend to do evaluation, at what stage cities were in the process, and the relationship of involvement in evaluation to other human services activities.

Table 16 indicates the responses to the survey question "Is the City now doing or contemplating evaluation?" Thirty-six percent of the cities are not contemplating any work in evaluation. This is the smallest percentage of cities in the sample not contemplating work in any aspect of human services. (Forty-nine percent of Bay Area cities do not intend to do a social element, 43% will not develop a social services inventory, and 38% are not contemplating a needs assessment.) Twenty-seven percent are now actively involved in evaluation while an additional 32% are considering such involvement.

Table 16 - City Involvement In Evaluation

Involvement	Total	Number of cities 62*	Percent 100%
Council has approved start up		3	5%
Work begin		12	19%
Work is completed		4	6%
Council has approved results		1	2%
(Total, actively involved		17	26%)
Work contemplated		20	32%
Work not contemplated		22	36%

*7 non responses

Are Cities Evaluating Their Programs?

Are cities evaluating the programs that they fund or operate?

Table 17 - City Involvement in Evaluation by Whether or Not Cities are Operating or Funding Human Services Programs

Involvement in Human Services Program Activities	Total	Involvement in Evaluation: Active Involvement	Involvement in Evaluation: Involvement Not Contemplated
Operation of Programs Total	60	16	22
Active Involvement	36	15	7
Not contemplated	19	-	15
Funding of Programs Sub-Total	59	15	21
Active Involvement	31	13	5
Not contemplated	21	1	15

Table 17 shows that 15 of the cities actually operating their own social programs are involved in evaluation. This is also true of 13 of the cities funding non-city programs. However, 7 of the cities delivering their own services, and 5 of the cities funding non-city services, report that they do not contemplate program evaluation.

Table 18 shows a similar breakdown in terms of whether cities are operating programs in the specific program categories of services to older adults, recreation, employment, children and youth services, and housing.

Table 18 - City Involvement in Evaluation by Type of Service Operated by City

City Involvement In Evaluation?	Service Category: Older Adults	Recreation	Employment	Children & Youth	Housing
Total Cities Involved in service area that responded to evaluation question	46=100%	47=100%	32=100%	36=100%	34=100%
Actively Involved In Evaluation	17(37%)	16(34%)	16(50%)	14(38%)	15(44%)
Evaluation not contemplated	12(26%)	12(26%)	2 (9%)	7(19%)	7(21%)

The findings indicate that of those 46 cities actually operating or funding aging programs, for example, only 37% are involved in evaluation, while another 26% are not contemplating evaluation. This finding holds true in all of the service categories.

The situation is different in those cities operating a wide variety of programs. Twenty-one of the cities are operating at least 10 different types of human service programs. Of these, 15 are now actively involved in evaluation activities and the remaining cities all contemplate evaluations.

The problem is most severe in terms of cities that do not operate a wide assortment of programs. Thirty-one cities operate from one to nine types of programs. Of these cities, 15 or 48% are not contemplating any evaluation activities and another 36% are contemplating but are not presently engaged in evaluation. In three cases, the council had given the "go ahead", but work had not yet begun at the time of the survey. In fact, with the exception of 2 cities, every city that is involved in evaluation operates at least 10 different types of programs. (These two cities run seven different types of programs each.)

Of the 10 cities that do not run any programs, seven are not contemplating evaluation. It is interesting that three of these cities are considering involvement in evaluation.

Comparison Between Cities' Evaluation Programs and Those not Contemplating Evaluation

- Cities involved in evaluation are much more likely to have specific human service staff than cities not contemplating evaluation. The respective percentages are 94% and 14%. As was the case with needs assessment, this staff is most frequently located in the city manager's office or in a separate human service department.

- All of the cities involved in evaluation state that there is some citizen participation in the planning process. Whether or not the citizens are involved in evaluation specifically was impossible to discern.

- Of the 32 cities reporting human services use of HCDA funds, 13 are actively involved in evaluation. Of the 38 cities using general fund for human services, 11 are actively involved in evaluation.

2. PROGRAM OPERATIONS AND FUNDING OF COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATIONS

In California, counties are the principal source of most social services; the largest proportion of Federal and State human services funds go to counties. At the same time, there is increasing city operation of social services, as the following discussion shows.

Extent of City Involvement in Social Programs

Tables 19 and 20 show the number of cities involved in the operation of social programs and the number of cities funding non-city social programs, respectively.

Table 19 - City Operation of Social Programs

	Total	Percent
Total	61*	100%
Work has begun	21	34%
Work is completed	9	15%
Council has approved results	8	13%
(Total, actively involved	38	62%)
Council has approved start up	1	2%
Work is contemplated	3	5%
Work is not contemplated	19	31%

* 8 non responses

Table 20 - City Funding of Non-City Social Programs

	Total	Percent
Total	61*	100%
Work has begun	15	25%
Work is completed	7	11%
Council has approved results	11	18%
(Total, actively involved	33	54%)
Council has approved start-up	3	5%
Work is contemplated	4	7%
Work is not contemplated	21	34%

* 8 non responses

These tables indicate that 62% of the cities are operating social programs and 54% are funding non-city programs. These proportions compare to 33% that are actively involved in needs assessment; 34% that are actively involved in a social services inventory, 19% that are doing a social element and 28% that are involved in evaluation activities. Thus, programs appear to receive more widespread attention than planning.

Table 21 shows that larger cities more frequently operate and fund programs. However, 36% of the smaller cities are operating and funding some social programs.

Table 21 - Social Program Activities, by Size of City

Population of City	Total	Operations of Programs		Funding of Non-City Programs	
		Not Contemplated	Actively Involved	Not Contemplated	Actively Involved
Total all Sizes*	61	19	38	21	31
Under 10,000	14	9	5	7	5
10,000-49,999	29	7	18	12	15
50,000-or more	18	3	15	2	13

* 8 non responses

Types of Programs Operated or Services Funded

Given the fact that between 50% and 60% of Bay Area respondents are operating or funding social programs--what types of programs are these? The alphabetical listing of services along with the number and percentage of cities involved in each is shown below in Table 22.[5]

Table 22 - Categories of Services, by Number and Percent of Cities Operating or Funding That Service

		Number	% of all Cities
A.	Alcoholism services	8	12 %
B.	Children and youth services	38	55 %
C.	Community care services	12	17 %
D.	Community groups/associations	22	32 %
E.	Consumer services	11	16 %
F.	Criminal justice services	25	36 %
G.	Drug abuse services	20	29 %
H.	Education services	18	26 %
I.	Emergency services	27	39 %
J.	Employment/training and economic development	33	48 %
K.	Environmental improvement	30	43 %
L.	Family Planning	6	9 %
M.	Financial services	9	13 %
N.	Health services	14	20 %
O.	Housing	34	49 %
P.	Legal services	3	4 %
Q.	Material resources	5	7 %
R.	Mental health services	11	16 %
S.	Recreation	51	74 %
T.	Services to older adults	50	72 %
U.	Developmental disabled services	9	13 %
V.	Services to the handicapped	25	36 %
W.	Volunteer services	17	25 %

[5] The categories were developed for Alameda county by members of the informal human services staff group including county staff, city staff, ABAG, the League, and United Way. A serious problem with this system was uncovered by the ABAG/League survey and corrected by the county in their final system. The categories of "employment and training and economic development" are combined. Hindsight has also shown that it would have been useful to have a separate category for "child care."

The most frequent categories of services reported are those to older adults, recreation services, employment services, children and youth services and housing. The least mentioned were services for the developmentally disabled (mentally retarded) and alcoholics, legal and financial services, and family planning. All of the least mentioned services, except for legal (which is often a Federal program), usually fall within the county domain under funding from Title XX (social services) or Short-Doyle (mental health).

Types of Services by County

Table 23 shows the distribution of types of services by county.

Table 23

TYPES OF CITY SERVICES BY COUNTY

COUNTY	Total Cities	Alcoholism	Children & Youth	Community Care	Community Groups	Consumer	Criminal Justice	Drug Abuse	Education	Emergency	Employment & Economic Development	Environmental Improvement	Family Planning	Financial	Health	Housing	Legal	Material Resources	Mental Health	Recreation	Services To Older Adults	Developmentally Disabled	Handicapped	Volunteer
ALAMEDA	12	1	10	2	4	2	9	5	5	8	10	5	1	4	6	9	1	1	5	11	10	3	3	3
% of county's cities having programs	100%	8%	83%	17%	33%	17%	75%	42%	42%	67%	83%	42%	8%	33%	50%	75%	8%	8%	42%	92%	83%	25%	25%	25%
CONTRA COSTA	12	1	5	--	1	1	3	6	3	--	5	3	--	--	2	6	--	--	2	8	8	--	5	2
% of county's cities having programs	100%	8%	42%	--	8%	8%	25%	50%	25%	--	36%	25%	--	--	17%	50%	--	--	17%	68%	68%	--	42%	17%
MARIN	6	--	3	1	3	--	1	--	--	2	--	2	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	4	4	--	2	1
% of county's cities having programs	100%	--	50%	17%	50%	--	17%	--	--	33%	--	33%	--	--	--	17%	--	--	--	67%	67%	--	33%	17%
NAPA	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
% of county's cities having programs	100%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SAN FRANCISCO	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
% of county's cities having programs	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
SAN MATEO	14	1	7	2	7	4	2	1	4	5	7	6	4	2	2	5	--	1	1	11	10	2	3	4
% of county's cities having programs	100%	7%	50%	14%	50%	29%	14%	7%	29%	36%	50%	43%	29%	14%	14%	36%	--	7%	7%	79%	71%	14%	21%	29%
SANTA CLARA	11	3	8	6	5	3	6	4	4	7	6	7	--	2	4	9	1	2	2	9	9	2	6	5
% of county's cities having programs	100%	27%	73%	55%	46%	27%	55%	36%	36%	37%	55%	64%	--	18%	36%	82%	9%	18%	18%	82%	82%	18%	55%	46%
SOLANO	4	1	1	--	--	--	2	2	--	1	1	2	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	3	2	--	2	--
% of county's cities having programs	100%	25%	25%	--	--	--	50%	50%	--	25%	25%	50%	--	--	--	50%	--	--	--	75%	50%	--	50%	--
SONOMA	8	--	4	--	1	--	2	2	1	3	4	4	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	5	6	1	3	1
% of county's cities having programs	100%	--	50%	--	13%	--	25%	25%	13%	38%	50%	50%	--	--	--	25%	--	--	--	63%	75%	13%	38%	13%
TOTAL																								

Variety of Types of Services

Most of the cities in the survey either funded or operated more than one type of service; only 12 cities did not deliver any services. Thirty-six percent of the cities operated from six to ten types of services, and 24% operated more than 10 different categories of services.

Table 24 shows a direct relationship between city size and variety of services operated:

Table 24 - Number of Types of Services Operated or Funded, by City Size

City Size	Number of Categories of Services					
	Total	0	1	2-5	6-10	11 or more
Total	69=100%	12(17%)	1(2%)	14(20%)	26(38%)	16(23%)
Under 10,000	16=100%	6(38%)	1(6%)	4(25%)	4(25%)	1(6%)
10,000-50,000	34=100%	6(18%)	0	10(29%)	13(38%)	5(15%)
50,000 or more	19=100%	0	0	0	9(47%)	10(53%)

What are the other characteristics of those 38 cities actively involved in operating social programs?

- In nine of the cities that are operating human services programs, the council had established an overall human service policy; in 18 of these cities, the council had established policies regarding specific issues. In 11 of these cities, council had taken no action vis-a-vis human services.

- Twenty-nine of the 38 cities have specific staff assigned to human services and four have a separate human service department. Again, most of the human services planning is done either by staff in the city manager's office or the planning department.

- Cities operating programs are also more likely to be attempting the integration of physical and social planning (63%) than those cities not contemplating the operation of programs (37%).

- It seems that all of the cities that are involved in planning are also operating programs. As has been shown, the reverse is not true. Some cities are operating programs but are not involved in human services planning.

For those cities operating human service programs, an important question exists regarding their relationship to county government. Inasmuch as counties are the prime providers of many social services, city-county communications regarding services, service levels, and service locations are essential. Of the 39 cities that are operating programs, 29 state some involvement with the county. The data do not show the nature or extent of this involvement (this may be a line of further investigation). There are 10 cities that are operating programs that report no involvement with the county.

C. FUNDING SOURCES USED FOR HUMAN SERVICE PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING

Table 25 shows the resources that cities are using to fund their human services planning and programming efforts.

Table 25 - Funding Sources Used for Human Services Planning & Programs

Source of Funds	Total Cities Using Source for H.S.		Cities Using Source for Planning Only	Cities Using Source for Programs Only	Cities Using Source for Both Planning & Programs
	No.	%	No.	No.	No.
Total	69	100%			
General Fund	38*	55%	13	10	14
General Revenue Sharing	23	33%	1	14	8
CETA	34	49%	5	22	7
HCDA	32	46%	7	8	17
HUD 701	12	17%	11	--	1
CSA (OEO)	7	10%	1	2	4
LEAA	5	7%	--	3	2
OAA (Older American Act)	3	4%	--	3	--
HEW	1	1%	--	1	--
Private Foundations	2	3%	2	--	--
Donations	3	4%	--	3	--
Bonds	2	3%	--	2	--
State grants	2	3%	--	2	--

* One respondent that reported the use of the General Fund for human services did not specify whether it was used for planning or programs.

Of great interest was whether cities are using funds that are specifically mandated for human services use, (such as Older American Act monies or HEW funds), or are they using resources that could be directed toward other purposes? In other words, are cities involved in human services activities merely because funds are available for those purposes? The findings revealed by Table 24 indicate that such is not the case. The use of portions of their discretionary money (such as General Fund and General Revenue Sharing) appears to indicate a basic commitment to human services, given the multiple demands on these funding sources. Thus, it is significant that over half of the cities were using General Fund monies for human service activities; it is also interesting that the emphasis appeared to be on planning--thirteen cities were using this money specifically for planning, 10 were using it only for programs operations and 14 cities were using General Fund for both planning and programs.

Twenty-three cities have allocated some General Revenue Sharing funds to human service activities. Table 25 shows that Revenue Sharing seems to be used mainly for program operations.

Aside from General Fund and General Revenue Sharing, the other major sources of revenue for human service activities are specific Federal programs (CETA, HCDA, HUD 701) which require grant applications. Because of the nature of the funding, it is likely that cities must devote a great deal of time to meeting Federal requirements and preparing grant applications. It is possible that "grantsmanship" skills are rewarded as much as or more than planning skills.

D. STAFFING FOR HUMAN SERVICES ACTIVITIES

Sixty percent (41 cities) of the cities in the survey reported that there was specific staff working in human services. Table 26 shows the organizational location of this staff.[6]

Table 26 - Organizational Location of Human Services Activities

Department	Number of Cities	Percentage
City Manager's Office	23	33%
Recreation	17	25%
Planning	15	22%
Department of Community Development	10	14%
Human Services Department	4	6%
Other (includes 2 health health departments, 2 police)	10	14%

6 Some 30% or 21 of the cities named only one department--14% or 10 named two; seven cities had three departments involved in human services activities; and five cities named four or more departments.

To determine where the major human service planning was done in a city, the survey examined the number of staff in each department reported to be involved in human service planning. (Part-time workers were not always reported as such.) The department with the largest number was considered to be the department where the principal human service planning occurred. This is an indirect measure and is probably not always accurate. However, since the question was not asked directly in the questionnaire, this indirect measure was used. Table 27 shows the results.

Table 27 - Organizational Location of Major Human Service Planning

	Number of cities*
City Manager's Office	20
Planning Department	7
Recreation Department	6
Human Services Department	4
Community Development Department	4

* It was possible to do this tabulation for only 41 cities.

It is notable that half of all human service planning is done in the city manager's office. Some of this planning probably involves staff who perform multiple administrative duties.

A Separate Human Services Department?

At the time of the survey, four of the cities had an operating human services department and four more were contemplating the establishment of one. Forty-four (77%) of the cities responding to this question said that they were not intending to establish such a department. In one city the Council had approved the establishment of a human services department and in five cities work was underway in that direction.

Whether or not a city has a human services department was found to be related to the size of the city and the county of jurisdiction. In cities with a population under 25,000, no such department had been set up, although in one of these cities the council had approved start up and in one other small city such action was contemplated.

The number of respondents not contemplating the establishment of such a department ran from a low of three (30%) of the cities in Alameda County to a high of 75% (cities in Solano) and 100% (cities in Marin and Sonoma).

E. CITY INVOLVEMENT WITH OUTSIDE AGENCIES - BOTH GOVERNMENTAL AND NON GOVERNMENTAL

The question of key interest in this section is with what specific outside agencies are cities involved in terms of human services activities and what are the methods of involvement? Since some of these findings have been discussed in previous sections of the report, only major findings will be highlighted here.

Table 28 identifies in rank order the major outside agencies with whom cities report involvement in terms of human services activities. The four groups named most often were county government, community action agencies (CAAs),[7] ABAG and the League of California Cities.

Table 28 - Agencies That are Involved With Cities in Human Service Activities

Agency	Number of Cities**	% of Total
County Government	39	57%
Community Action Agencies	26	38%
ABAG (COG)	25	37%
League of California Cities*	21	30%
Other Cities	18	26%
United Way	17	25%
State Government***	11	16%
CSAC*	4	6%
Professional Associations	1	2%

* It should be noted that the League and CSAC are public interest groups and not operating agencies per se, as are some of the other agencies mentioned. It is probable that staff in many of the cities has read the League's "Social Action Plan" and are using their needs assessment handbook, but did not report such as "involvement".

** Cities often named more than one agency.

*** State agencies most frequently cited were the Department of Education, Department of Health and the Governor's Office of Planning and Research.

---

[7] CAAs are public or non-profit agencies that were originally set up in 1964 under the Office of Economic Opportunity (now the Community Services Administration). These organizations do social planning and operate and/fund social and economic services. While originally, most CAAs were private non-profit corporations, many have become part of county and city government.

Table 29 shows the breakdown by county.

Table 29 - Agencies That are Involved With Cities in Human Services, by County

County*		Agency									
			Community					Other		United	
Total	Total Cities	County	Action Agency		ABAG		League	Cities		Way	
		# %	#	%	#	%	# %	#	%	#	%
Alameda	12 = 100%	8 (67%)	8	(67%**)	7	(58%)	6 (50%)	6	(50%)	3	(25%)
Contra Costa	12 = 100%	7 (58%)	0		3	(25%)	3 (25%)	1	(8%)	2	(17%)
Marin	6 = 100%	3 (50%)	1	(17%)	2	(33%)	1 (17%)	1	(17%)	0	
San Mateo	14 = 100%	9 (64%)	5	(36%)	3	(21%)	1 (7%)	2	(14%)	1	(7%)
Santa Clara	11 = 100%	7 (64%)	8	(73%)	7	(64%)	6 (54%)	6	(55%)	6	(54%)
Solano	4 = 100%	1 (25%)	3	(75%)	1	(25%)	2 (50%)	1	(25%)	2	(50%)
Sonoma	8 = 100%	4 (50%)	1	(12%)	1	(12%)	1 (12%)	1	(12%)	2	(25%)

* Napa and San Francisco are not included in this tabulation. The one city respondent in Napa County did not answer this question; San Francisco, as has been noted, is both a city and a county.

** The Alameda County CAA does not have jurisdiction over 2 city respondents--Berkeley and Oakland which operate their own CAAs.

Fifty-seven percent of the cities showed some involvement with their county government. As Table 29a shows, for cities in all counties the planning department was a major point of contact, followed by the social services department, the human services agency (which is sometimes an umbrella agency), the health department and the county administrators' office. The county social services department received substantial use by cities in Marin and Santa Clara counties.

Table 29a - County Agency of City-County Involvement by County

County*	Total Cities Responding in County	Planning	Social Services	H.S. Agency Umbrella	Health	CAO
Total**		29	18*	12	10*	5%
Alameda Co.	12 = 100%	6 (50%)	2 (18%)	3 (25%)	3 (25%)	2 (18%)
Contra Costa County	12 = 100%	4 (33%)	2 (17%)	4 (33%)	---	1 (8%)
Marin Co.	6 = 100%	2 (33%)	3 (50%)	1 (17%)	---	---
San Mateo Co.	14 = 100%	8 (57%)	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)
Santa Clara Co.	11 = 100%	6 (55%)	5 (45%)	2 (23%)	2 (23%)	---
Sonoma Co.	8 = 100%	3 (38%)	2 (25%)	1 (12%)	1 (12%)	---

* Numbers do not always add to total, because San Francisco, Solano and Napa counties are not shown in the detailed breakdown.

Other related findings of interest are:

- Aside from the cities in Solano County there are no major variations by county in terms of city-county involvement.

- The services of community action agencies in the counties of Santa Clara, Alameda, and Solano were used by many of the cities within their jurisdiction.

- Cities in Alameda and Santa Clara counties show the largest proportion of human services involvement with ABAG. This involvement has often been in the form of technical assistance to cities from ABAG.

Methods of Involvement

The cities were asked to specify, if they could, how this cooperation or coordination took place. Thirty cities responded, some mentioned more than one method.

- Fifteen cities reported the use of "information sharing"--such as conferences or informal staff groups of city human service planners. Eight of these cities are in Alameda County and four are in Contra Costa--both of which have an informal staff group of city human service planners which meets regularly.

- Five cities stated that they had received technical assistance. Examples given of technical assistance were data and research assistance; assistance in design of a needs assessment; assistance in the development of a social service inventory; assistance in doing a social element; and actual staff support.

- Five cities mentioned joint program development. It is to be noted that joint program development with the county or with other cities was required of some HCDA applications. By no means did the survey elicit the full universe of cities who were involved in this manner with other agencies.

- Three cities stated that they had a representative on a county or agency board, commission or task force (such as the county human service planning council, county human relations commission, etc.).

- Two cities stated that the city serves as an advocate to affect the planning or programming of county services.

Does involvement with specific outside agencies vary according to where the major human service planning occurs? The answer is shown below:

Table 30 - Cities Showing Involvement With Specific Agencies, By Agency

Dept. of Major H. S. Planning	Total	County Govt.	CAA	ABAG	League	Other Cities	United Way
Total	41						
City Manager	20=100%	14(70%)	12(60%)	11(55%)	9(45%)	8(40%)	6(30%)
Planning	7=100%	5(71%)	4(57%)	2(29%)	1(14%)	1(14%)	1(14%)
Recreation	6=100%	4(67%)	2(33%)	1(17%)	2(33%)	1(17%)	---
Human Service	4=100%	4(100%)	4(100%)	3(75%)	3(75%)	4(100%)	3(75%)
Community Development	4=100%	4(100%)	1(25%)	3(75%)	2(50%)	1(25%)	3(75%)

When the major planning is done by the recreation and planning departments, the likelihood of external interaction with any agency except the county is less than when the planning is done in other departments. When a city has a separate human service department, such involvement is reported to occur most often.

As suggested by the League of California Cities, the city is the appropriate level of government to assess human services needs that will be addressed by city, county, and other resources. The League urges cities to deliver or fund services only when needs cannot be met by other agencies and resources. Since there is not the clearly defined assignment of responsibility in human services as in other functional areas, this field is recognized as requiring a high degree of intergovernmental cooperation.

In an interview survey done in 1976 by Urban Management Consultants for ABAG, the 12 city respondents interviewed stated three reasons that there was not better cooperation among cities, counties and private and public agencies:

1. Lack of adequate resources to undertake the effort required
2. Administrative barriers in the form of "turf protection"
3. Lack of political commitment to improving coordination of human services planning and delivery.

Cities interviewed felt that if effective integration between service providers and planners on various levels could be met within county boundaries, the "non system" of human services might indeed become a "system."

City representatives were divided as to the proper focus of better communication and coordination in the area of human services. One-half of those interviewed felt the focus should be on the county, the other half felt it should be on human services agencies operating in their jurisdictions.

The subject of county-agency-city coordination is also discussed in the ABAG publication, Overview of Human Services Planning in County Government and Selected Human Services Agencies in the San Francisco Bay Area.

F. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PHYSICAL AND SOCIAL PLANNING

The integration of physical and social planning, as difficult as it is to attain and define, is seen as a critical goal by many cities. This was a major finding of the interviews done by Urban Management Consultants for ABAG and is substantiated by the findings of the ABAG/League survey.

The survey question was phrased broadly in order to let the city respondents define what they meant by social-physical integration.

> "Have there been any attempts in your city to integrate physical and social planning? If so, what steps have been taken."

Thirty-seven cities reported attempts to attain this integration; thirty-four mentioned specific steps that had been taken.

- Fourteen cities stated that "social planning" is accomplished through traditional planning processes; e.g., adding social planners to planning departments or addressing social issues in elements of the general plan.
- Seven cities said that this integration was approached through HCDA planning processes such as the Housing Assistance Plan.
- Five cities were addressing this issue through the addition of a social element to the general plan.
- Three cities were using commission review of proposed projects for potential social impact.
- Two cities were using staff and departmental communication, interaction, and review--both formal and informal.
- One city is using social impact analysis.
- One city stressed growth management.
- One city mentioned development of physical facilities for social services.

Table 31 shows that attempts at integrating physical and social planning occur more frequently in those cities in which the major human service planning is done by the city planning department or a separate human services department.

Table 31 - Integration of Physical & Social Planning

Where is Major H.S. Planning Done?		Has Integrated Planning Been Attempted? Yes	No
Total	41 = 100%	28	13
City Manager's Office	20 = 100%	11 (55%)	9 (45%)
Planning Department	7 = 100%	7(100%)	---
Recreation	6 = 100%	3 (50%)	3 (50%)
Human Services	4 = 100%	4(100%)	---
Community Development	4 = 100%	3 (75%)	1 (25%)

The methods of this integration seem to vary by department. When the city manager's office is the center for city human services planning, the major emphasis is on adding a social element to the general plan or addressing social issues in elements of the general plan. When the major human services planning is done in the planning department, emphasis is on traditional planning processes--such as including social planners in the planning department. Human resources departments appeared to use HCDA planning processes. The rest of the responses were evenly distributed throughout.

G. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

The active participation of persons other than staff and elected officials has become recognized as an integral part of an open planning process. The survey looked at three aspects of citizen participation:

Did citizen participation occur in human service planning?

How did it occur?

Who was involved?

Did Citizen Participation Occur?

Only 22% of the cities in the survey stated that there has been no citizen participation in human service planning. In 50 cities (72%) there was reported to be such citizen involvement (four cities did not respond to this question).

How Is Citizen Participation Accomplished?

Most cities used more than one method for obtaining citizen input.

Almost half or 34 of all cities in the survey reported that citizen participation was accomplished through public hearings. Many used appointed committees, city commissions, and neighborhood councils. Other methods mentioned less often were surveys and workshops.

Some cities report citizen participation through membership on planning commissions. Twenty-seven percent of the cities surveyed were in some stage of establishing a new city human services commission to do this planning. Another 42% were using an existing commission to do human services planning.

Who Is Involved?

The following groups or organizations were named as being involved in the citizen participation process. They are shown below in descending order of reported involvement. (Table 32)

Table 32 - Groups Involved in Citizen Participation

	Number of Cities	Percent of Total
Community based groups	39	56%
Service provider groups	31	45%
Service clubs or groups	25	36%
Ethnic or minority groups	24	35%
Client oriented groups	20	29%
Professional associations	12	17%

Are those cities that report citizen participation in their planning processes more likely to be funded by a specific source--perhaps a source that requires this participation?

Table 33 - Funding Source by Whether or Not Cities Involve Citizens in Planning

Is there Citizen Participation?	Total	General Fund	General Revenue Sharing	HCDA	CETA
Total	65				
Yes	50=100%	34 (68%)	21 (42%)	31 (62%)	33 (66%)
No	15=100%	3 (20%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	---

The major finding shown in Table 33 is that those cities without citizen participation usually do not utilize the major funding sources.

H. OTHER CITY HUMAN SERVICES ACTIVITIES

The section below focuses on features of a city's human services system--be it programs or planning--that the city respondents felt to be unique. The question asked was "Are there any innovative or unique features of the city's human resources activities which may not have been covered in the previous questions?"

The list below is a slightly edited version of city responses. It should be noted that some respondent cities stressed specific unique programs (Corte Madera, Albany, Los Gatos, Daly City, Menlo Park), while others referred to innovations in the social planning process (Hayward, Concord and Novato).

Selected responses from cities outside of the Bay Area have been included because it was felt that those responses might be of interest to Bay Area cities.

BAY AREA CITIES

Albany	"We have a mini employment opportunities program which assists unemployed residents to find work."
Brentwood	"City does the human services planning and other planning for all of the unincorpoated areas surrounding it. There is an ad hoc committee for social planning and part of the planning director's time is donated to this."
Concord	"We have done both a Social Service Study and a Public Facilities Study. We have designed a monthly updated Directory of Social Services."
Corte Madera	"Day Care programs for K-6 children (6:45 a.m. to 6:45 p.m.); Integrating handicapped into programs; Volunteer services in lieu of payment for DPss recipients; Teen drop-in program."
Daly City	"The city operates a Community Services Center."
Hayward	"We have developed an innovative and comprehensive needs assessment design that may be used by other cities to determine their level of involvement in social services."
Los Gatos	"Los Gatos has a subsidized tax program for seniors/disabled and a senior nutrition program."
Menlo Park	"City's youth employment program places youth in jobs in private sector with the city handling administration counseling, placement assistance, applicant prescreening and paying 1/2 salary for a set period (i.e., summer or school year); employer provides learning job experience, supervision and training, and 1/2 of salary."
Milpitas	"The city and school district, whose boundaries are virtually coterminous, share the cost of a joint recreation program which utilizes the community schools concept. (Schools open for public use after normal school hours.)"
Novato	"City of Novato is currently defining and evaluating alternative options for City Council consideration of the City's proper social role regarding policy determination, needs assessment, comprehensive planning, priorities establishment, plan implementation, monitoring, and evaluation."
Palo Alto	"We have developed some instruments such as questionnaire for evaluation; budget formats; survey research results on child care."
Richmond	"Our second year's effort--a Human Services Improvement Plan--hopefully will be a unique tool of implementation."

San Bruno	"We are trying to purchase a former school through HCDA funds and provide offices for Welfare Department; Social Security; Mental Health, etc., for one day a week per agency so to bring the service closer to those in need. Other uses under serious consideration are day care; hot lunch for senior citizens, room for teens; plus Junior College classes including English for Spanish-speaking persons. Unfortunately, Federal red tape will most likely kill this because the value of the property is rising faster than we can get the necessary Federal okays to buy the property. As a result, the parcel's cost will probably end up more than the HCDA funds available."
San Leandro	"The city volunteer services program recruits and refers volunteers and works with social services agencies in the use of volunteers."
San Pablo	"The city through recreation and parks department operates the only known mobile recreation and service center for the elderly in the U.S.--the center is located at 10 locations and varies weekly."
Santa Rosa	"The proposed social element attempts to expand the use of the EIR to assess the social environment at the same level as the physical environment."

Cities Outside of the Bay Area

Davis	"Combined recreation and social services programs for senior citizens, handicapped children, child care, mental patients, etc. Operation at fraction of cost if independently operated."
Arcata	"If all goes well, our Social Element will be completed by July, since we are using HUD 701 funds, we hope it will serve as something of a pilot program for other cities."
Arvin	"Delinquency prevention program--CCCJ/LEAA Grant."
Placentia	"The Social Services Department is responsible for coordinating the overall planning, delivery and evaluation of social services programs for the entire City...for all residents. The four member office is funded solely from the city's general fund. Most of the actual service delivery is done through cooperation with other agencies at no cost to the city other than providing space and telephones."
South El Monte	"Recreation and social services have been combined under one director with two separate commissions."
Pasadena	"The establishment of a Human Services Department which consolidated the city's major resources. These functions included two formerly separate departments (recreation and public health) and two agencies: Manpower-CETA and community services (Human Relations staff and multi-purpose centers)."
San Bernardino	"Recently formed an Education/Human Services Committee consisting of public, private and business representatives to explore joint planning and programming. Assigned CETA slot-administrative aide."
Santa Barbara	"The efforts of the City of Santa Barbara in terms of planning are well summarized in the enclosed City Social Services Plan. Provision of services has been for the most part by contract with existing social service agencies using City general revenue sharing resources. Total commitment by the City includes $20,000 yearly. General fund resources have been used to coordinate and maintain social service activities at a neighborhood social services facility."
Long Beach	"Formation of Ad hoc Advisory Commission composed of delegates from other boards and agencies who will help screen and monitor survey information and will make recommendations as to policy input for the forthcoming human services plan."
Laguna Beach	"Community or neighborhood-centered home child care centers with activities coordinated with existing nursery and preschool facilities. Community or neighborhood gardens, working toward developing sense of community."

Gardena	"The Gardena Human Services Department is one of the few social service agencies which is a full-fledged department within the city. Its three bureaus: Youth services, family services and senior citizens, provide comprehensive, direct services to the community. In addition, the department's program support unit's varied responsiblities include: technical assistance to community groups; research and program development; public information; and working with other governmental agencies to provide their services to Gardena."

V. CONCLUSION

A large number of Bay Area cities are directly involved in human service activities. The scope of these activities in planning, operating, and funding programs--is especially significant because city human services involvement is not mandated by law. The survey indicates that the major funding sources used by cities for social programs are not necessarily those specifically mandated for human services use. Instead, cities are choosing to use General Fund and General Revenue Sharing funds to solve social problems. Cities are operating and funding a variety of programs including services for senior citizens, children, youth and the handicapped, emergency services and programs directed at employment, training, economic development, housing, and criminal justice activities. In addition, many city councils have adopted policies to address human services issues.

Many cities are involved in basic aspects of social planning--such as assessing community needs, inventorying available human services and preparing a social element of the general plan. Some cities have already established human services departments and others are considering such a step. In most cities, human services staffing is located in the city manager's office.

Survey data reveal varying degrees of city involvement with outside agencies such as county government, community action agencies, ABAG, the League of California Cities, other cities, and United Way. Perhaps the most important of these outside agencies is county government, the major provider of human services in California. The multiplicity of local agencies involved in the planning and operation of social programs underscores the need for cooperation. For example, since service delivery is frequently a non-city function, if a city's social plan is to be effectively implemented, it must be able to connect the actions of different agencies that are delivering services to city residents. The fact that city involvement with outside agencies is widespread, but not universal, suggests the critical need for open lines of communication among all service providers and planners in the public and private sectors. For more discussion on county government and human services agency cooperation, see the recent ABAG report entitled, Overview of Human Services Planning in County Government and Selected Human Services Agencies in the San Francisco Bay Area.

Subjects for Further Study and Action

There are subjects of increasing interest to policy makers and planners that should be pursued.

The League's 1973 Social Action Plan suggested the following areas which might be included in a "technical assistance program":

"A. How are social service needs assessed and identified?

B. What is a valid basis for evaluating the effectiveness of social programs?

C. A review of existing successful and effective social programs.

D. Organizational requirements for effective coordination of social service programs in a city."

In addition, in early 1976 an ABAG Task Force of elected officials and human service staff defined several basic issues, including local government capacity building needs:

> "There is growing indication that member governments desire assistance in obtaining the capability and skills to fulfill their responsibility. There are expressed needs for the transfer and application of human service technology, for assistance in predicting future human service needs, for communication and information exchange, and for tapping additional human service resources." (ABAG Human Service Capacity Building Task Force)

The survey has revealed a wide range of human service activities being undertaken by cities. Of significance is the large number of cities either contemplating or just beginning major efforts which could benefit from information exchange and the application of successful techniques used elsewhere. Certain of these areas are addressed in ABAG's current human services work program:

Evaluation

- The survey showed that some cities that are operating programs do not appear to be evaluating these programs. This year ABAG will prepare a report on program evaluations used by member governments including various methods and ways evaluations are used in policy decisions.

Social Plan Elements

- The survey indicated that several cities are preparing social plan elements--even more cities intend to do so. This year ABAG will prepare a report including an analysis of common plan elements, of implementation methods, and of "successful" plans and planning processes in the Bay Area.

Data For Planning

- Cities are using a variety of data sources for social planning, often combining qualitative with quantitative data. ABAG is preparing a human services "data packet" for member governments--a guide to data sources and the uses of data in planning and local human services policy decisions.

Social-Physical Planning "Integration"

- A majority of the cities report that they are attempting to "integrate" physical and social planning. The methods being used indicate that there are almost as many definitions of this activity as there are cities. This area is a new and rather vague one. ABAG will make efforts toward identifying major points of contact between physical, economic, environmental and human services planning.

Finally, there are recent State legislative activities of considerable significance to those involved in local human service policy-making. Of importance are two bills which were introduced in the last legislative session but were not approved: it is expected that these bills will be reintroduced in some form in next year's session. Cities and other providers and planners of human services should be aware of the innovative implications of this potential new legislation:

- The Assembly Committee on Human Resources proposed the California Social Planning Act (AB 4034). This bill proposed to rationalize the planning process for county and State social services planning (Title XX). It would have assured the input of and coordination with cities and other local agency social planners and providers in this process.

- Assemblymen Gualco and Calvo proposed AB 3352, which provided an optional alternative to the general plan for cities and counties. This option included the addition of a major "human resource analysis" component. As conceived, this legislation would address the integration of physical and social planning.

Already approved State legislation of interest to cities and counties includes AB 3507, AB 3508 and ACR 169 - bills that provide for the creation of some basic tools for social planning. All are to be implemented by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR):

- AB 3507 provides for a uniform human services classification system to be used by counties in developing their mandated inventories of social services.

- AB 3508 provides for the preparation of socio-economic data profiles of each county.

- ACR 169 mandates a feasibility study investigating the possibilities of developing a "common reporting format" for the purpose of establishing a common data base to be utilized by local governments.

ABAG intends to monitor this legislation on behalf of its members.

ABAG will do an update of Bay Area city human services activity in 1977. Comments on the format and content of this survey would be appreciated, both for immediate information exchange purposes as well as design of the survey update.

A P P E N D I X E S

Appendix A- Survey Questionnaire

NAME OF CITY _____

NAME OF PERSON COMPLETING QUESTIONNAIRE _____

POPULATION OF CITY _____
(CURRENT DEPT. OF FINANCE ESTIMATE)

POSITION _____

COUNTY IN WHICH CITY IS LOCATED _____

TELEPHONE _____

LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES/ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

HUMAN RESOURCES QUESTIONNAIRE

1. (a) Has the city council established an overall formal policy describing its commitment to deal with social problems existing within its boundaries?

_____ Yes

_____ No

_____ Council has established policies only on individual specific social issues such as drug abuse, child care, etc.

(b) How was council action taken?

_____ Ordinance

_____ Resolution

_____ Minute Action

_____ Other, please specify

_____

2. Is the city contemplating or now doing any of the following activities? (Please check one space for each activity below)

	(1) Work is contemplated	(2) Council has approved start up	(3) Work has begun	(4) Work is completed	(5) Council has approved results	(6) Work is not contemplated
a. Needs Assessment	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Inventory of Social Services	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Development of a Social Element	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Development of an Implementation Plan	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Operation of Some Social Programs	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Evaluation of Human Resources Policies and Programs	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. Establishment of Human Resources Dept., Agency or Unit	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
h. Establishment of City Human Resources Planning Commission	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
i. Use of an Existing Commission To Do Human Resources Planning	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
j. Funding of Non-City Organization or Services	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
k. Other, Please Specify						
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

3. What tools or techniques are being used by the city to identify human resources needs? (Please check below all tools and techniques that are being used)

_____ a. Census data

_____ b. Statistical information from agencies, planning departments, etc. What is the source of your data?

_____

_____ c. Social service inventories

_____ d. Surveys or questionnaires undertaken by the city

_____ e. Polk Directory "Profiles of Change"

_____ f. Citizen and consumer input. If yes, is there a formalized mechanism for this input? _____

_____ g. Service provider input

_____ h. Other sources, please specify _____

4. Are there specific city staff responsible for human resources activities? YES _____ NO _____ If yes, where are they located and how many are involved in planning and in operations? (Planning is defined as activities such as needs assessment, inventories of social services, and other activities leading to the development of human resources policy, goals and objectives. Program operations is defined as the actual delivery of a social service to a client.)

	# of Staff in Planning	# of Staff in Program Operations
_____ a. City Manager's Office	_____	_____
_____ b. Separate Human Resources Dept. of Office	_____	_____
_____ c. Department of Community Development	_____	_____
_____ d. Planning Department	_____	_____
_____ e. Recreation Department	_____	_____
_____ f. Other, Please Specify		
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

5. Have there been any attempts in your city to integrate physical and social planning? YES _____ NO _____
If yes, what steps have been taken? _____

_____

6. (a) Has there been citizen involvement in the planning for human resources activities? YES _____ NO _____
If yes, how has this participation occurred? (Please check all applicable methods)

_____ 1. Through city commissions
_____ 2. Through appointed committees
_____ 3. Through neighborhood councils
_____ 4. Through public hearings
_____ 5. Other, please specify _____

(b) In your citizen participation, do you involve any of the following groups or organizations? (Please check all that are involved)

_____ 1. Client oriented groups (e.g., National Welfare Rights Association)
_____ 2. Service provider groups (e.g., United Way)
_____ 3. Ethnic or minority groups or organizations (e.g., NAACP, women's advocacy groups)
_____ 4. Community based groups (e.g., neighborhood organizations)
_____ 5. Professional associations (e.g., labor unions, AMA)
_____ 6. Service clubs or groups (e.g., Kiwanis, Taxpayers Association)
_____ 7. Other, please specify _____

7. What is the source of funds you are using for human resources planning or human resources programs? (Please check the applicable spaces below. You do not need to state dollar amount. For our definition of planning and programs, please see Question #4.)

	Human Resource Planning	Human Resource Programs
_____ a. General Revenue Sharing	_____	_____
_____ b. General Fund	_____	_____
_____ c. HCDA	_____	_____
_____ d. HUD 701	_____	_____
_____ e. CETA	_____	_____
_____ f. CSA (OEO)	_____	_____
_____ g. Private Foundations	_____	_____
_____ h. Other, Please Specify		
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

8. What types of human resource activities has the city undertaken either in terms of service delivery or funding? (Please check all that are applicable)

_____ a. Alcoholism services
_____ b. Children and youth services
_____ c. Community care services
_____ d. Community groups/associations
_____ e. Consumer services
_____ f. Criminal justice services
_____ g. Drug abuse services
_____ h. Education services
_____ i. Emergency services
_____ j. Employment/training and economic development
_____ k. Environmental improvement
_____ l. Family Planning
_____ m. Financial services
_____ n. Health services
_____ o. Housing
_____ p. Legal services
_____ q. Material resources
_____ r. Mental health services
_____ s. Recreation
_____ t. Services to older adults
_____ u. Developmentally disabled services
_____ v. Services to the handicapped
_____ w. Volunteer services
_____ x. Other, please specify _____

9. Has there been involvement or coordination in human resources planning or programs with any of the following (this includes such activities as training and technical assistance)?

_____ a. State government (please indicate department or agency such as OPR, etc.) _____
_____ b. Councils of Governments (i.e., ABAG, SCAG, CPO, SRAPC, AMBAG)
_____ c. CSAC (County Supervisors Association of California)
_____ d. League of California Cities
_____ e. Other cities.
_____ f. County government (please indicate department or agency, such as Department of Social Services, etc.)

_____

_____ g. Community Action Agency
_____ h. United Way
_____ i. Professional Associations (e.g., CPRS, Welfare Directors Ass'n., etc.) _____
_____ j. Other, please specify _____

* * * * If possible, please specify how this coordination or cooperation has taken place:

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. Are there any innovative or unique features of the city's human resources activities which may be useful to other cities and which may not have been covered in the previous questions?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

* * * * * * PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE ON OR BEFORE MARCH 15, 1976 TO: * * * * * *

LEAGUE/ABAG HUMAN RESOURCES QUESTIONNAIRE
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS
HOTEL CLAREMONT
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94705

Appendix B - Coding Scheme

CODE FOR LEAGUE/ABAG HUMAN RESOURCE QUESTIONNAIRE

LINE 1:

Columns 1-5: zip code of cities

Columns 6-12: population

Column 13: population category
- code #1. under 10,000
- 2. 10,000 to 24,999
- 3. 25,000 to 49,999
- 4. 50,000 to 99,999
- 5. 100,000 or more

Columns 14-16: County listing code

code #1.	Alameda	33.	Santa Cruz
2.	Contra Costa	34.	---
3.	Marin	35.	Alpine
4.	Napa	36.	Amador
5.	San Francisco	37.	Butte
6.	San Mateo	38.	Calaveras
7.	Santa Clara	39.	Colusa
8.	Solano	40.	Del Norte
9.	Sonoma	41.	Glenn
10.	---	42.	Humboldt
11.	Sacramento	43.	Inyo
12.	Sutter	44.	Kern
13.	Yolo	45.	Kings
14.	Yuba	46.	Lake
15.	---	47.	Lassen
16.	Sierra	48.	Madera
17.	---	49.	Mariposa
18.	El Dorado	50.	Mendocino
19.	Placer	51.	Merced
20.	---	52.	Modoc
21.	Imperial	53.	Mono
22.	Los Angeles	54.	Plumas
23.	Orange	55.	San Benito
24.	Riverside	56.	San Luis Obispo
25.	San Bernardino	57.	Santa Barbara
26.	Ventura	58.	Shasta
27.	---	59.	Siskiyou
28.	San Diego	60.	Stanislaus
29.	---	61.	Tehama
30.	San Joaquin	62.	Trinity
31.	Fresno	63.	Tulare
32.	Monterey	64.	Tuolumne

LINE 1: continued

Columns 17-19: COG listing

code #1. ABAG
2. AMBAG
3. Butte County Association
4. Central Sierra
5. Sierra Planning Organization
6. San Joaquin
7. Fresno
8. Humboldt
9. Inyo-Mono
10. Kern
11. Kings
12. Lake County Association
13. Mendocino
14. Merced
15. SCRAPC
16. San Diego CPO
17. San Luis Obispo
18. Santa Barbara
19. Shasta
20. Siskiyou
21. SCAG
22. Stanislaus
23. Tahoe Regional Planning
24. Tri-County
25. Tulare

Column 20: (Q.1a) code #1. yes 2. no 3. Council has established policies...

Column 21: (Q. 1b) code #1. ordinance 2. resolution 3. minute action

Columns 22-34 (Q. 2 a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i,j,
k: other
l: coordination of services
m: special studies)
are all coded as follows:
#1. Work is contemplated
2. Council has approved start up
3. Work had begun
4. Work is completed
5. Council has approved results
6. Work is not contemplated

Column 35: (Q.2n) City's involvement
code #1. planning 2. programs 3. both planning and programs

Columns 36-41: Median income
Columns 42-45: % of population change 1960-1970
Columns 46-48: % of population under 5 yrs.
Columns 49-51: % of population over 65 yrs.
Columns 52-54: % of population black
Columns 55-57: % of population with Spanish surname

Columns 58-59: Position of questionnaire respondent

code #1. City Manager
2. Human Services Director
3. Planning Director or staff
4. Administrative Assistant
5. Assistant to City Manager
6. Supervisor of Social Services
7. City Administrator (same as #1)
8. Personnel Department staff
9. Research Analyst
10. Director of Parks and Recreation
11. City Engineer
12. Deputy City Manager
13. Division of Management Services
14. City Councilmember
15. City Clerk
16. Director Community Relations
17. CAP staff

LINE 2:

Columns 1-2: (Q. 3a,c) code #1. yes or left blank

Columns 3-7: (Q. 3b) open ended response for listing agencies

code #	1.	City Planning	7.	United Way/Social Planning Council
	2.	Other city department		
	3.	County Planning	8.	COG's
	4.	Other County Departments	9.	LCC
	5.	State Departments	10.	Schools
	6.	CAA's		

Columns 8-11: (Q. 3c,d,e,f) all have following code # 1. yes or left blank

Column 12: (Q. 3f) formalized mechanism code #1. yes 2. no

Column 13: (Q. 3f) code for the formalized mechanism

code #1.		Hearings	3.	Neighborhood meetings
	2.	Committees/commissions	4.	Both 2 and 3

Column 14: (Q. 3g) code #1. yes or left blank

Column 15: (Q. 4) code #1. yes 2. no

Column 16: (Q. 4a) City Manager's Office involvement

code #1.		Planning	3.	Both planning and program operations
	2.	Program operations		

Columns 17-18: (Q. 4a) total number in planning
Columns 19-21: (Q. 4a) total number in program operations

Column 22: (Q. 4b) Separate Human Resource Department involvement

code #1.		Planning	3.	Both planning and program operations
	2.	Program operations		

Columns 23-24: (Q.4b) number in planning
Columns 25-27: (Q. 4b) number in program operations

Column 28: (Q. 4c) Department of Community Development involvement

code #1.		Planning	3.	Both planning and program operations
	2.	Program operations		

Columns 29-30: (Q. 4c) number in planning
Columns 31-33: (Q. 4c) number in program operations

Column 34: (Q. 4d) Planning Department involvement

code #1.		Planning	3.	Both planning and program operations
	2.	Program operations		

Columns 35-36: (Q. 4d) number in planning
Columns 37-39: (Q. 4d) number in program operations

Column 40: (Q. 4e) Recreation Department involvement

code #1.		Planning	3.	Both planning and program operations
	2.	Program operations		

Columns 41-42: (Q. 4e) number in planning
Columns 43-45: (Q. 4e) number in program operations

LINE 2: continued

Column 46: (Q. 4f) Police Department involvement
code #1. Planning
2. Program operations
3. Both planning and program operations
Columns 47-48: (Q. 4f) number in planning
Columns 49-51: (Q. 4f) number in program operations

Column 52: (Q. 4g) Health Department involvement
code #1. Planning
2. Program operations
3. Both planning and program operations
Columns 53-54: (Q. 4g) number in planning
Columns 55-57: (Q. 4g) number in program operations

Column 58: (Q. 4h) Other departments involvement
code #1. Planning
2. Program operations
3. Both planning and program operations
Columns 59-60: (Q. 4h) number in planning
Columns 61-63: (Q. 4h) number in program operations

Column 64: The total number of Departments checked (possible code #1 thru 8)

Column 65: Separate Human Resource Department code #1. yes 2. no

Column 66: Where is the major planning done?
code #1. City Manager's Office
2. Human Resource Department
3. Department of Community Development
4. Planning Department
5. Recreation Department
6. Police Department
7. Health Department
8. Other department

Column 67: (Q. 5) code #1. yes 2. no
Columns 68-69: (Q. 5) Open ended question
code #1. Through the addition of a Social Element to the General Plan. Addressing social issues in elements of the General Plan.
2. Social planning is accomplished through traditional planning processes; e.g., adding social planners to planning departments.
3. Through Social Impact Analysis or addressing social issues in EIR.
4. Through HCDA planning processes (Housing Assistance Plan).
5. Staff and departmental communication, interaction, and review, both formal and informal.
6. Commission interaction and review of proposals to determine social impact.
7. Training of commissions to understand social impact.
8. Through growth management policies.
9. Development of physical facilities for social services.

LINE 3:

Column 1: (Q. 6) code #1. yes 2. no

Columns 2-5: (Q. 6a.1,2,3,4) code #1. yes or are left blank

Column 6: (Q. 6a5) other response is coded
#1. Surveys/noninteractive processes
2. Community based groups
3. Conferences, workshops, meetings.

Column 7: Total number of items checked in question 6a.

Columns 8-13: (Q. 6b.1,2,3,4,5,6) are all coded #1. yes or left blank

Column 14: (Q.6b7) other response is coded
#1. CAA
2. Schools
3. Volunteer groups/student groups
4. Chamber of Commerce

Columns 15-27: (Q. 7a,b,c,d,e,f,g,
h: LEAA
i: HEW
j: OAA
k: Private Donation/private employers share
l: Bonds
m: State Grants
n: Other Federal

are all coded the same:
code #1. Planning
2. Programs
3. Both planning and programs
4. No check used

Columns 28-51: (Q. 8) Listing of Services
code #1. yes or is left blank

Columns 52-53: Total of the items check in question 8.

Column 54: (Q. 9a)
code # 1. Cal Trans
2. State Recreation and Parks Department
3. EDD
4. Department of Education
5. OPR
6. Department of Health and Welfare
7. Other
8. Yes, but no indication of agency

Columns 55-58: (Q. 9 code) code #1. yes or left blank

LINE 3: continued

Column 59: 1 yes or blank 60 - total county agencies 61-62 - 2 digit agency; 63 - 2nd agency; 69 - 1st agency

coded #1. General
2. Umbrella Human Service Agency
3. Health
4. Social Services
5. Mental Health/Alcohol
6. Manpower Department (CETA)
7. CAO
8. Human Services Planning Council
9. AAA
10. RCJPB
11. CAA's
12. Probation/Juvenile Justice
13. Sheriff's Department
14. Area Office on Aging/ Department of Senior Citizens
15. Other
16. Yes, but no indication of agency

Columns 65-67: (Q. 9ghi) code #1. yes or left blank

Columns 68-69-70: (Q. 9j) Allows for three reponses to the question - 68 first

Code #1. City receives technical assistance (examples of technical assistance are data and research assistance, assistance in design of needs assessment, social services inventory, social elements, technology transfer, staff support or loan, publicity).

2. City receives training in human services planning and programs.

3. Information-sharing (conferences, informal staff groups of city human services planners.

4. City has a representative on county or agency board, commission or task forces (such as county human services planning council, county human relations commission, CETA or CAP policy board).

5. Social agencies are represented on city planning board.

6. Joint program development proposal submission - with other cities or with county.

7. City serves as an advocate to affect the planning or programming of county services.

Appendix C - List of Bay Area Respondents and Non respondents

BAY AREA CITIES RESPONDING TO HUMAN SERVICES SURVEY BY COUNTY

ALAMEDA COUNTY

Alameda
Albany
Berkeley
Fremont
Hayward
Livermore
Newark
Oakland
Piedmont
Pleasanton
San Leandro
Union City

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

Antioch
Brentwood
Concord
El Cerrito
Hercules
Martinez
Moraga
Pinole
Pittsburg
Richmond
San Pablo
Walnut Creek

MARIN COUNTY

Corte Madera
Fairfax
Larkspur
Mill Valley
Novato
San Rafael

NAPA COUNTY

Yountville

SAN FRANCISCO

SAN MATEO COUNTY

Belmont
Brisbane
Colma
Daly City
Half Moon Bay
Menlo Park
Pacifica
Redwood City
San Bruno
San Carlos
San Mateo
South San Francisco
Woodside

SANTA CLARA COUNTY

Campbell
Cupertino
Gilroy
Los Gatos
Milpitas
Morgan Hill
Mountain View
Palo Alto
San Jose
Santa Clara
Saratoga

SONOMA COUNTY

Cloverdale
Cotati
Healdsburg
Petaluma
Rohnert Park
Santa Rosa
Sebastopol
Sonoma

SOLANO COUNTY

Dixon
Fairfield
Vacaville
Vallejo

Cities Not Responding

ALAMEDA COUNTY

Emeryville

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

Clayton
Lafayette
Pleasant Hill

MARIN COUNTY

Belvedere
Ross
San Anselmo
Sausalito
Tiburon

NAPA COUNTY

Calistoga
Napa
Saint Helena

SAN MATEO COUNTY

Atherton
Burlingame
Foster City
Hillsborough
Millbrae

SANTA CLARA COUNTY

Los Altos
Los Altos Hills
Monte Sereno
Sunnyvale

SOLANO COUNTY

Benicia
Rio Vista
Suisun City

SONOMA COUNTY

None

Appendix D Examination of the Representativeness of the Bay Area Sample in Terms of Selected Demographic Characteristics

Income

In 1970 the median family income for the total Bay Area was $11,745.4.* In the ABAG survey of 69 cities, 43% were below that figure and 57% were above it. The ABAG survey median was $11,938.

Ten cities (14%) showed median family incomes below $10,000; twelve cities (17%) had median family incomes above $14,500. The greatest majority--41 cities or 59%--showed incomes in the mid-range of $10,000-$14,499. Incomes ranged from a low of $7,980 to a high of $21,144. If these incomes seem low, it should be noted that what is measured is 1969 annual income. Inflation has changed the situation a great deal.

Population Change Between 1960 and 1970

The San Francisco Bay Area Council shows a net population gain of 27.2% between 1960 and 1970 for the nine county bay region. The median percentage population gain for cities in the survey was 46.5%. Only 25 cities or 36% were below the regional percentage while 39 cities or 56% were above it. Six of the cities actually lost population, half of which were in Alameda County. Two of the cities losing population were very large (100,000 or over) and three (or half) had populations of between 10,000 and 24,999. Twenty cities had a net growth of over 75%. (Seven of these twenty were in Santa Clara County; five were in Alameda County.)

Older Persons (65 yrs +) and Preschool Children (Children under 5)

Two target groups that include many of the clients for service activity are senior citizens and children of day care age.

Regional figures show the percentage of persons 65 years or older as 8.9%; 56% of the cities who responded to the survey were below that percentage and 44% were above it. The survey's median percentage of 8.25% was close to the regional figure.

The percentage of children under five was 10.7% regionwide. The median percentage of cities in the survey was lower--8.2%. Sixty-four of the cities responding were below the regional median and only five were equal to or above it.

---

* The source of the total Bay Area data is Bay Area 1970 Census Series; San Francisco Bay Area Council.

Blacks and Persons of Spanish Heritage

The Bay Area Council's report shows the regional percentage of blacks to be 7.9%. The cities in the survey had a black population of 9.5%. Non-responding cities in the Bay Area show a percentage of blacks of only .8%.

It was more difficult to judge the representativeness of the sample in terms of Spanish-speaking persons. The Bay Area Council shows a regional percentage of Spanish speaking of 15.5%. However, published information on this variable was available for only 29 of the respondent cities because of the policy of suppression used by the U. S. Bureau of the Census--the ultimate source of the Bay Area Council's data. Suppression is used to prevent the disclosure of identity. In terms of persons of Spanish heritage, the City-County Data Book shows the suppression level at 400 for any given city.

APPENDIX E

LISTS OF CITIES INVOLVED IN SPECIFIC HUMAN SERVICES ACTIVITIES

APPENDIX E - 1

COUNCIL POLICY

Cities in which Council Has Established an Overall Formal Policy	Cities Not Having Overall Formal Policy	Council Has Established Policies & Specific Social Issues Only
Cotati	Portola Valley	Menlo Park
Half Moon Bay	Rohnert Park	Daly City
San Mateo	Belmont	Mountain View
Fremont	Brisbane	Redwood City
Hayward	Colma	San Carlos
Pittsburg	Pacifica	South San Francisco
Pleasanton	Woodside	Palo Alto
San Leandro	San Bruno	Alameda
Vallejo	Antioch	El Cerrito
Oakland	Brentwood	Newark
Mill Valley	Concord	Piedmont
Campbell	Fairfield	Berkeley
Saratoga	Hercules	Albany
Vacaville	Livermore	Richmond
	Martinez	San Pablo
	Moraga	Corte Madera
	Pinole	Petaluma
	Union City	Gilroy
	Walnut Creek	Santa Clara
	Yountville	San Francisco
	San Rafael	Sonoma
	Fairfax	
	Larkspur	
	Novato	
	Cupertino	
	Los Gatos	
	Milpitas	
	Morgan Hill	
	San Jose	
	Santa Rosa	
	Cloverdale	
	Healdsburg	
	Sebastopol	
	Dixon	

APPENDIX E - 2

CITIES INVOLVED IN NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Work Contemplated	Council Approved Start Up	Work Has Begun	Work Is Completed	Council Has Approved Results	Work Is Not Contemplated
Menlo Park	Daly City	Cotati	Redwood City	Fairfield	Portola Valley
Brisbane	San Rafael	South San Francisco	San Mateo	Los Gatos	Rohnert Park
Half Moon Bay		Palo Alto	San Leandro		Belmont
Mountain View		Concord	Milpitas		Colma
Fremont		Hayward			Pacifica
Moraga		Livermore			Woodside
Newark		Union City			San Bruno
Pinole		Berkeley			Alameda
Pittsburg		Richmond			Antioch
Pleasanton		Campbell			Brentwood
Vallejo		Morgan Hill			El Cerrito
Walnut Creek		Saratoga			Hercules
Piedmont		San Jose			San Pablo
Oakland		Santa Rosa			Corte Madera
Mill Valley					Larkspur
Cupertino					Gilroy
San Francisco					Santa Clara
					Cloverdale
					Healdsburg
					Sebastopol
					Sonoma
					Dixon
					Vacaville

APPENDIX E - 3

CITIES INVOLVED IN INVENTORY OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Work Contemplated	Council Approved Start Up	Work Has Begun	Work Is Completed	Council Has Approved Results	Work Is Not Contemplated
Brisbane	Daly City	Cotati	Concord	Redwood City	Portola Valley
Half Moon Bay		Menlo Park	Hayward	Alameda	Rohnert Park
Mountain View		South San Francisco	Martinez		Belmont
San Mateo		Palo Alto	Pleasanton		Colma
Fremont		Livermore	San Leandro		Pacifica
Moraga		Berkeley	Union City		Woodside
Newark		Albany	Los Gatos		San Bruno
Pinole		Richmond	Milpitas		Antioch
Pittsburg		Campbell	San Jose		Brentwood
Vallejo		Morgan Hill			El Cerrito
Walnut Creek		Saratoga			Fairfield
Piedmont		San Francisco			Hercules
Cupertino					Oakland
					San Pablo
					San Rafael
					Larkspur
					Mill Valley
					Gilroy
					Santa Clara
					Santa Rosa
					Cloverdale
					Healdsburg
					Sebastopol
					Sonoma
					Dixon
					Vacaville
					Corte Madera

CITIES INVOLVED IN DEVELOPMENT OF A SOCIAL ELEMENT

Work Contemplated	Council Approved Start Up	Work Has Begun	Work Is Completed	Council Has Approved Results	Work Is Not Contemplated
Menlo Park	Daly City	Redwood City	Campbell	Pleasanton	Portola Valley
Brisbane		Union City	Santa Rosa		Rohnert Park
Mountain View		Berkeley			Belmont
South San Francisco		Richmond			Colma
Palo Alto		Mill Valley			Half Moon Bay
Brentwood		Los Gatos			Pacifica
Fairfield		Morgan Hill			Woodside
Moraga		Saratoga			San Bruno
Newark					San Mateo
Pinole					Alameda
Pittsburg					Antioch
San Leandro					Concord
Vallejo					El Cerrito
Walnut Creek					Fremont
Piedmont					Hayward
Cupertino					Livermore
San Francisco					Oakland
Healdsburg					San Pablo
					San Rafael
					Corte Madera
					Larkspur
					Gilroy
					Santa Clara
					Cloverdale
					Sebastopol
					Sonoma
					Dixon
					Vacaville

APPENDIX E - 5

CITIES INVOLVED IN DEVELOPMENT OF AN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Work Contemplated	Council Approved Start Up	Work Has Begun	Work Is Completed	Council Has Approved Results	Work Is Not Contemplated
Menlo Park	Redwood City	Campbell	San Leandro	Pleasanton	Portola Valley
Brisbane		Morgan Hill	San Jose		Rohnert Park
Half Moon Bay		Santa Rosa			Belmont
South San Francisco					Colma
Palo Alto					Mountain View
Fremont					Pacifica
Moraga					Woodside
Newark					San Bruno
Pinole					San Mateo
Pittsburg					Alameda
Union City					Antioch
Walnut Creek					Brentwood
Piedmont					Concord
Berkeley					El Cerrito
Richmond					Fairfield
Cupertino					Hercules
Los Gatos					Livermore
Saratoga					Vallejo
San Francisco					Oakland
					San Pablo
					San Rafael
					Corte Madera
					Larkspur
					Mill Valley
					Gilroy
					Santa Clara
					Cloverdale
					Healdsburg
					Sebastopol
					Sonoma
					Dixon
					Vacaville

CITIES INVOLVED IN OPERATION OF SOME SOCIAL PROGRAMS

Work Contemplated	Council Approved Start Up	Work Has Begun	Work Is Completed	Council Has Approved Results	Work Is Not Contemplated
Moraga	Albany	Menlo Park	Pacifica	Mountain View	Portola Valley
Pinole		Brisbane	Livermore	Palo Alto	Rohnert Park
Pittsburg		Daly City	Pleasanton	Concord	Belmont
Piedmont		Half Moon Bay	San Leandro	Hayward	Colma
		San Bruno	Walnut Creek	Newark	Woodside
		San Carlos	Oakland	Union City	Antioch
		South San Francisco	Richmond	Morgan Hill	Brentwood
			Santa Clara	Sonoma	Fairfield
		San Mateo	San Jose		Hercules
		Alameda			Vallejo
		El Cerrito			Fairfax
		Fremont			Mill Valley
		Berkeley			Cupertino
		San Pablo			Saratoga
		San Rafael			Santa Rosa
		Corte Madera			Cloverdale
		Petaluma			Healdsburg
		Campbell			Sebastopol
		Gilroy			Dixon
		Los Gatos			
		San Francisco			
		Vacaville			

CITIES INVOLVED IN EVALUATION OF HUMAN RESOURCES POLICIES & PROGRAMS

Work Contemplated	Council Approved Start Up	Work Has Begun	Work Is Completed	Council Has Approved Results	Work Is Not Contemplated
Cotati	Daly City	Menlo Park	Palo Alto	Hayward	Portola Valley
Brisbane	Newark	Half Moon Bay	San Leandro		Rohnert Park
Redwood City	Vallejo	San Mateo	Oakland		Belmont
South San Francisco		Walnut Creek	Milpitas		Colma
Alameda		Berkeley			Mountain View
Concord		Albany			Pacifica
Fairfield		Campbell			Woodside
Fremont		Gilroy			San Bruno
Livermore		Los Gatos			Antioch
Moraga		San Francisco			Brentwood
Pinole		San Jose			El Cerrito
Pittsburg		Sonoma			Hercules
Pleasanton					San Pablo
Union City					San Rafael
Piedmont					Larkspur
Richmond					Mill Valley
Corte Madera					Cupertino
Morgan Hill					Santa Clara
Saratoga					Cloverdale
Santa Rosa					Healdsburg
Vacaville					Sebastopol
					Dixon

CITIES INVOLVED IN ESTABLISHMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Work Contemplated	Council Approved Start Up	Work Has Begun	Work Is Completed	Council Has Approved Results	Work Is Not Contemplated	Work Is Not Contemplated (cont'd)
San Mateo	Pleasanton	Menlo Park	Palo Alto	Hayward	Portola Valley	Morgan Hill
Fremont		Newark	San Leandro	Union City	Rohnert Park	Santa Clara
Pinole			Oakland	Richmond	Belmont	Saratoga
Pittsburg					Brisbane	San Francisco
Vallejo					Colma	Santa Rosa
					Daly City	Cloverdale
					Half Moon Bay	Healdsburg
					Mountain View	Sebastopol
					Pacifica	Sonoma
					Woodside	Dixon
					Redwood City	Vacaville
					San Bruno	
					South San Francisco	
					Alameda	
					Antioch	
					Brentwood	
					Concord	
					El Cerrito	
					Fairfield	
					Hercules	
					Livermore	
					Walnut Creek	
					Piedmont	
					San Pablo	
					San Rafael	
					Corte Madera	
					Larkspur	
					Mill Valley	
					Campbell	
					Cupertino	
					Gilroy	
					Los Gatos	
					Milpitas	

CITIES INVOLVED IN ESTABLISHMENT OF CITY HUMAN RESOURCES COMMISSION

Work Contemplated	Council Approved Start Up	Work Has Begun	Work Is Completed	Council Has Approved Results	Work Is Not Contemplated	Work Is Not Contemplated (cont'd)
Redwood City	Cotati	San Carlos	Alameda	Hayward	Menlo Park	Campbell
San Mateo	Pleasanton	Los Gatos	Martinez	Livermore	Portola Valley	Cupertino
Concord		Vacaville	Newark		Rohnert Park	Gilroy
Berkeley			San Leandro		Belmont	Milpitas
Novato			Dixon		Brisbane	Morgan Hill
					Daly City	Santa Clara
					Half Moon Bay	San Francisco
					Mountain View	San Jose
					Pacifica	Cloverdale
					Woodside	Healdsburg
					San Bruno	Sebastopol
					South San Francisco	Sonoma
					Palo Alto	Santa Rosa
					Antioch	
					Brentwood	
					El Cerrito	
					Fairfield	
					Fremont	
					Hercules	
					Pinole	
					Pittsburg	
					Union City	
					Vallejo	
					Walnut Creek	
					Piedmont	
					Oakland	
					Richmond	
					San Pablo	
					San Rafael	
					Corte Madera	
					Larkspur	
					Mill Valley	

CITIES INVOLVED IN USE OF AN EXISTING COMMISSION TO DO HUMAN RESOURCES PLANNING

Work Contemplated	Council Approved Start Up	Work Has Begun	Work Is Completed	Council has Approved Results	Work Is Not Contemplated
Half Moon Bay	San Mateo	Palo Alto	Alameda	Redwood City	Menlo Park
Mountain View	Fremont	Newark	Oakland	Milpitas	Portola Valley
South San Francisco	Hayward	Mill Valley	Richmond		Rohnert Park
Pinole	Walnut Creek	Campbell	Santa Rosa		Belmont
Pittsburg		Gilroy			Brisbane
Union City					Colma
Berkeley					Daly City
Los Gatos					Pacifica
Morgan Hill					Woodside
San Francisco					San Bruno
Vacaville					Antioch
					Brentwood
					Concord
					El Cerrito
					Fairfield
					Hercules
					Livermore
					Martinez
					San Leandro
					Vallejo
					Piedmont
					San Pablo
					San Rafael
					Corte Madera
					Larkspur
					Cupertino
					Santa Clara
					Saratoga
					San Jose
					Cloverdale
					Healdsburg
					Sebastopol
					Sonoma
					Dixon

CITIES INVOLVED IN FUNDING OF NON-CITY ORGANIZATION OR SERVICES

Work Contemplated	Council Approved Start Up	Work Has Begun	Work Is Completed	Council Has Approved Results	Work Is Not Contemplated
Half Moon Bay	Cotati	Menlo Park	Portola Valley	Redwood City	Belmont
Alameda	South San Francisco	Daly City	Rohnert Park	Palo Alto	Colma
Concord	Healdsburg	San Carlos	Brisbane	Fairfield	Woodside
Pleasanton		San Mateo	Mountain View	Hayward	San Bruno
		Antioch	Pacifica	Union City	Brentwood
		Fremont	Pinole	Richmond	El Cerrito
		Martinez	San Jose	Corte Madera	Hercules
		Pittsburg		Milpitas	Livermore
		San Leandro		Morgan Hill	Newark
		Walnut Creek		Sonoma	Vallejo
		Petaluma		Vacaville	Piedmont
		Campbell			Oakland
		Gilroy			San Pablo
		Los Gatos			San Rafael
		San Francisco			Larkspur
		Santa Rosa			Mill Valley
					Cupertino
					Saratoga
					Cloverdale
					Sebastopol
					Dixon

TOOLS OR TECHNIQUE USED BY THE CITY TO IDENTIFY HUMAN RESOURCES NEEDS

Census Data	Statistical Information	Social Service Inventories	Surveys Or Questioneers	Polk Directory "Profiles of Change"	Citizen & Consumer Input	Service Provider Input	Other Sources
Cotati	Menlo Park	Menlo Park	Cotati	Hayward	Cotati	Cotati	
Menlo Park	Brisbane	Mountain View	Menlo Park	Pittsburg	Menlo Park	Menlo Park	
Brisbane	Daly City	San Bruno	Brisbane	Gilroy	Brisbane	Brisbane	
Daly City	Half Moon Bay	South San Francisco	Redwood City	Santa Clara	Half Moon Bay	Redwood City	
Half Moon Bay	Mountain View	Palo Alto	San Bruno	San Jose	Pacifica	San Carlos	
Mountain View	Woodside	Alameda	South San Francisco	Santa Rosa	Redwood City	Palo Alto	
Redwood City	Redwood City	Brentwood	Palo Alto		San Carlos	San Mateo	
San Bruno	South San Francisco	Concord	Antioch		Palo Alto	Alameda	
San Carlos	Palo Alto	Fremont	Brentwood		San Mateo	Concord	
South San Francisco	Alameda	Hayward	Concord		Alameda	Fremont	
Palo Alto	Brentwood	Livermore	El Cerrito		Brentwood	Hayward	
San Mateo	Concord	Newark	Fairfield		Concord	Livermore	
Alameda	Hayward	Pittsburg	Hayward		Fairfield	Newark	
Brentwood	Livermore	Pleasanton	Livermore		Hayward	Pittsburg	
Concord	Newark	San Leandro	Pittsburg		Livermore	San Leandro	
El Cerrito	Pinole	Union City	San Leandro		Moraga	Berkeley	
Fremont	Pittsburg	Vallejo	Union City		Newark	Richmond	
Hayward	Pleasanton	Oakland	Vallejo		Pinole	Corte Madera	
Livermore	San Leandro	Berkeley	Walnut Creek		Pittsburg	Novato	
Moraga	Union City	Albany	Oakland		San Leandro	Campbell	
Newark	Vallejo	Richmond	Berkeley		Union City	Los Gatos	
Pinole	Walnut Creek	Corte Madera	Albany		Vallejo	Morgan Hill	
Pittsburg	Piedmont	Novato	Richmond		Walnut Creek	Saratoga	
Pleasanton	Oakland	Campbell	San Rafael		Oakland	San Francisco	
San Leandro	Berkeley	Gilroy	Campbell		Berkeley	San Jose	
Union City	Richmond	Los Gatos	Gilroy		Albany		
Vallejo	San Pablo	Milpitas	Los Gatos		Richmond		
Walnut Creek	Corte Madera	Morgan Hill	Milpitas		San Pablo		
Piedmont	Fairfax	Saratoga	Morgan Hill		San Rafael		
Oakland	Novato	San Francisco	Saratoga		Corte Madera		
Berkeley	Petaluma	San Jose	San Jose		Petaluma		
Albany	Campbell	Santa Rosa	Santa Rosa		Campbell		
Richmond	Gilroy		Sonoma		Gilroy		
San Pablo	Los Gatos		Vacaville		Los Gatos		
San Rafael	Milpitas				Morgan Hill		
Fairfax	Morgan Hill				Saratoga		
Mill Valley	Saratoga				San Francisco		
Novato	San Francisco				San Jose		
Campbell	San Jose				Santa Rosa		
Gilroy	Santa Rosa				Healdsburg		
Los Gatos	Healdsburg				Sonoma		
Milpitas	Sonoma				Vacaville		
Morgan Hill	Vacaville						
Santa Clara							
Saratoga							
San Francisco							
San Jose							
Santa Rosa							
Healdsburg							
Sonoma							
Vacaville							

FUNDING SOURCES USED FOR HUMAN SERVICES

GENERAL FUND

Planning	Programs	Both	Source Used, Purpose Not Stated
Daly City	Pacifica	Cotati	Mill Valley
Half Moon Bay	Woodside	Menlo Park	
South San Francisco	Redwood City	San Carlos	
Alameda	Antioch	Palo Alto	
Brentwood	Concord	El Cerrito	
Fremont	Albany	Martinez	
Hayward	San Pablo	Pleasanton	
Moraga	Corte Madera	Union City	
Newark	Petaluma	Walnut Creek	
Pinole	Gilroy	Piedmont	
Richmond		Berkeley	
Morgan Hill		Campbell	
Saratoga		Los Gatos	
		San Jose	

GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

Planning	Programs	Both	Source Used, Purpose Not Stated
Healdsburg	Daly City	Menlo Park	
	Woodside	Brisbane	
	South San Francisco	Redwood City	
	Palo Alto	San Leandro	
	San Mateo	Union City	
	Fremont	Walnut Creek	
	Livermore	San Jose	
	Albany	Santa Rosa	
	Richmond		
	Petaluma		
	Campbell		
	Gilroy		
	Morgan Hill		
	Hayward		

HCDA

Planning	Programs	Both
Martinez	Pacifica	Menlo Park
San Leandro	Redwood City	South San Francisco
Richmond	San Bruno	San Mateo
Milpitas	San Carlos	Alameda
Morgan Hill	Hayward	Brentwood
Saratoga	Pinole	Concord
Sonoma	Berkeley	Fairfield
	Gilroy	Livermore
		Newark
		Pittsburg
		Union City
		Walnut Creek
		Oakland
		Albany
		San Pablo
		Campbell
		Los Gatos
		Santa Rosa

HUD 701

Planning	Programs
Menlo Park	Gilroy
Daly City	
Redwood City	
San Mateo	
Alameda	
Concord	
Pittsburg	
Walnut Creek	
Richmond	
San Francisco	
San Jose	
Santa Rosa	

FUNDING SOURCES USED FOR HUMAN SERVICES (cont'd)

CETA

Planning	Programs	Both	Source Used, Purpose Not Stated
Menlo Park	Daly City	South San Francisco	Mill Valley
Palo Alto	Redwood City	Hayward	
San Mateo	San Bruno	Pittsburg	
Alameda	Brentwood	San Leandro	
	Fremont	Union City	
	Livermore	Oakland	
	Martinez	San Francisco	
	Newark	San Jose	
	Vallejo		
	Berkeley		
	Albany		

CSO (OEO)

Planning	Programs	Both
Palo Alto	Newark	Half Moon Bay
	Berkeley	Union City
		Oakland
		Campbell

PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS

Planning	Programs
Gilroy	
Healdsburg	

WHAT TYPES OF HUMAN RESOURCE ACTIVITIES EXIST IN TERMS OF SERVICE DELIVERY OR FUNDING

Alcoholism	Children & Youth	Community Care	Community Groups	Consumer Services	Criminal Justice Services	Drug Abuse Services
Pacifica	Menlo Park	Brisbane	Menlo Park	Brisbane	Pacifica	San Carlos
Palo Alto	Brisbane	Mountain View	Daly City	Daly City	San Carlos	Palo Alto
Vallejo	Daly City	South San Francisco	Half Moon Bay	South San Francisco	Palo Alto	Concord
Berkeley	Mountain View	Palo Alto	Redwood City	Palo Alto	Fairfield	Fremont
Richmond	Pacifica	Alameda	San Carlos	Concord	Fremont	Hayward
Gilroy	Redwood City	San Leandro	South San Francisco	San Leandro	Hayward	Martinez
San Francisco	San Carlos	Corte Madera	San Mateo	Berkeley	Livermore	Pittsburg
San Jose	South San Francisco	Campbell	Hayward	Gilroy	Pittsburg	San Leandro
	Palo Alto	Milpitas	San Leandro	San Francisco	Pleasanton	Union City
	Concord	San Francisco	Piedmont	San Jose	San Leandro	Vallejo
	Fremont	San Jose	Albany	Redwood City	Union City	Walnut Creek
	Hayward	Gilroy	Richmond		Vallejo	Berkeley
	Livermore		San Rafael		Oakland	Richmond
	Newark		Mill Valley		Berkeley	San Pablo
	Pittsburg		Novato		Albany	Gilroy
	Pleasanton		Campbell		Richmond	Santa Clara
	San Leandro		Gilroy		San Pablo	San Francisco
	Union City		Los Gatos		Novato	San Jose
	Walnut Creek		Milpitas		Petaluma	Santa Rosa
	Oakland		San Francisco		Gilroy	Sonoma
	Berkeley		San Jose		Los Gatos	Vacaville
	Albany		Sonoma		Milpitas	
	Richmond				Morgan Hill	
	San Pablo				San Francisco	
	San Rafael				San Jose	
	Corte Madera				Sonoma	
	Mill Valley					
	Petaluma					
	Campbell					
	Gilroy					
	Milpitas					
	Morgan Hill					
	Santa Clara					
	San Francisco					
	San Jose					
	Santa Rosa					
	Sebastopol					
	Sonoma					
	Vacaville					

WHAT TYPES OF HUMAN RESOURCE ACTIVITIES EXIST IN TERMS OF SERVICE DELIVERY OF FUNDING (cont'd)

Education Services	Emergency Services	Employment/Training & Economic Development	Environmental Improvement	Family Planning	Financial Services	Health Services
Menlo Park	Brisbane	Menlo Park	Menlo Park	Menlo Park	Daly City	Daly City
Brisbane	Half Moon Bay	Brisbane	Portola Valley	Brisbane	San Carlos	Mountain View
Half Moon Bay	Mountain View	Daly City	Brisbane	Daly City	Hayward	South San Francisco
Mountain View	Redwood City	Half Moon Bay	Redwood City	Pacifica	Union City	Palo Alto
South San Francisco	San Bruno	Redwood City	San Carlos	Berkeley	Oakland	Fremont
Concord	South San Francisco	South San Francisco	South San Francisco	San Francisco	Berkeley	Hayward
Hayward	Palo Alto	Palo Alto	Palo Alto		Gilroy	Newark
San Leandro	Fremont	San Mateo	Alameda		San Francisco	Pittsburg
Walnut Creek	Hayward	Alameda	Brentwood		San Jose	San Leandro
Oakland	Newark	Concord	Fairfield			Oakland
Berkeley	San Leandro	Fremont	Hayward			Richmond
Albany	Vallejo	Hayward	Walnut Creek			Berkeley
Richmond	Piedmont	Livermore	Piedmont			Gilroy
Campbell	Oakland	Newark	Berkeley			San Francisco
Gilroy	Albany	Pittsburg	Albany			San Jose
San Francisco	San Rafael	San Leandro	Richmond			
San Jose	Corte Madera	Union City	San Rafael			
Santa Rosa	Petaluma	Walnut Creek	Mill Valley			
	Campbell	Oakland	Petaluma			
	Gilroy	Berkeley	Gilroy			
	Los Gatos	Albany	Los Gatos			
	Milpitas	Richmond	Milpitas			
	San Francisco	San Pablo	Morgan Hill			
	San Jose	Petaluma	Santa Clara			
	Santa Rosa	Campbell	San Francisco			
	Sonoma	Gilroy	San Jose			
	Berkeley	Milpitas	Santa Rosa			
		Morgan Hill	Healdsburg			
		San Francisco	Sonoma			
		San Jose	Vacaville			
		Santa Rosa				
		Healdsburg				
		Sonoma				
		Vacaville				

WHAT TYPES OF HUMAN RESOURCE ACTIVITIES EXIST IN TERMS OF SERVICE DELIVERY OF FUNDING (cont'd)

Housing	Legal Services	Material Resources	Mental Health Services	Recreation	Services To Older Adults	Developmentally Disabled
Menlo Park	Oakland	San Carlos	Half Moon Bay	Menlo Park	Menlo Park	San Carlos
Mountain View	San Francisco	San Leandro	Alameda	Portola Valley	Rohnert Park	Palo Alto
Pacifica	San Jose	Gilroy	Concord	Rohnert Park	Brisbane	San Mateo
Redwood City		San Francisco	Fremont	Brisbane	Daly City	Fremont
South San Francisco		San Jose	Hayward	Daly City	Half Moon Bay	Hayward
Palo Alto			San Leandro	Mountain View	Mountain View	Berkeley
San Mateo			Walnut Creek	Pacifica	Pacifica	San Francisco
Alameda			Berkeley	Woodside	Redwood City	San Jose
Brentwood			San Francisco	Redwood City	San Bruno	Santa Rosa
Fairfield			San Jose	San Bruno	San Carlos	
Fremont				San Carlos	South San Francisco	
Hayward				South San Francisco	Palo Alto	
Livermore				Palo Alto	San Mateo	
Pinole				San Mateo	Alameda	
Pittsburg				Alameda	Antioch	
San Leandro				Concord	Concord	
Union City				El Cerrito	El Cerrito	
Vallejo				Fairfield	Fairfield	
Walnut Creek				Fremont	Fremont	
Oakland				Hayward	Hayward	
Berkeley				Martinez	Livermore	
Albany				Newark	Martinez	
Richmond				Pinole	Newark	
San Pablo				Pittsburg	Pinole	
Mill Valley				Pleasanton	Pleasanton	
Campbell				San Leandro	San Leandro	
Gilroy				Union City	Walnut Creek	
Los Gatos				Vallejo	Oakland	
Milpitas				Walnut Creek	Berkeley	
Morgan Hill				Piedmont	Albany	
Santa Clara				Oakland	Richmond	
San Francisco				Berkeley	San Pablo	
San Jose				Albany	San Rafael	
Santa Rosa				Richmond	Corte Madera	
Sebastopol				San Pablo	Mill Valley	
				San Rafael	Novato	
				Corte Madera	Petaluma	
				Mill Valley	Campbell	
				Novato	Gilroy	
				Petaluma	Los Gatos	
				Campbell	Milpitas	
				Gilroy	Morgan Hill	

WHAT TYPES OF HUMAN RESOURCE ACTIVITIES EXIST IN TERMS OF SERVICE DELIVERY OF FUNDING (cont'd)

Services Handicapped

Brisbane
San Carlos
Palo Alto
San Mateo
Antioch
Concord
El Cerrito
Fairfield
Fremont
Hayward
Walnut Creek
Berkeley
Richmond
Corte Madera
Mill Valley
Petaluma
Campbell
Gilroy
Los Gatos
Morgan Hill
San Francisco
San Jose
Santa Rosa
Sonoma
Vacaville

Volunteer Services

Menlo Park
Brisbane
Half Moon Bay
Mountain View
San Carlos
Hayward
San Leandro
Walnut Creek
Oakland
San Pablo
Corte Madera
Campbell
Gilroy
Los Gatos
San Francisco
San Jose
Santa Rosa

Recreation (cont'd)

Los Gatos
Milpitas
Morgan Hill
Santa Clara
San Francisco
San Jose
Santa Rosa
Healdsburg
Sonoma
Vacaville

Services To Older Adults (cont'd)

Santa Clara
San Francisco
San Jose
Santa Rosa
Healdsburg
Sebastopol
Sonoma
Vacaville

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES
C124900690